

The REFORMED REVIEW



The Reformed Church in America

A Quarterly Journal of the
WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Holland, Michigan

September 1960

Volume 14

Number 1

The Reformed Review

Volume 14

Holland, Michigan, September, 1960

Number 1

A Quarterly Journal of the Western Theological Seminary

ON WEARING CHRIST'S YOKE	<i>Harold N. Englund</i>	1
THE PROTESTANT APPROACH TO ROMAN CATHOLICISM	<i>John H. Kromminga</i>	9
PROGRAM OF ADVANCED RELIGIOUS STUDIES	<i>Peter Hsieh</i>	19
ORIGINAL ARMINIANISM AND METHODISTIC ARMINIANISM COMPARED	<i>James Meeuwssen</i>	21
THE INFLUENCE OF JEREMIAH UPON NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE	<i>Henry J. Boekhoven</i>	37
CAMPUS HIGHLIGHTS		44

BOOK REVIEWS

A History of Israel, by John Bright	<i>Lester J. Kuyper</i>	48
The Letter to the Romans, by Emil Brunner	<i>Thomas Boslooper</i>	50
The Evidence of Tradition, by Daniel J. Theron	<i>Vernon H. Kooy</i>	51
Studies in the Sermon on the Mount, by D. Martin Lloyd Jones	<i>Glen O. Peterman</i>	52
The Christ of the Gospels, by William F. Beck	<i>Lambert J. Ponstein</i>	54
The Epistle to the Romans, by John Murray	<i>Lambert J. Ponstein</i>	54
Predestination, and Other Papers, by Pierre Maury	<i>M. E. Osterhaven</i>	55
Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life, by Ronald S. Wallace	<i>Elton J. Bruins</i>	56
God is Inescapable, by David Wesley Soper	<i>James W. Meeuwssen</i>	57
Point of Glad Return, by Lance Webb	<i>Donald P. Buteyn</i>	57
Steps to Salvation, by John H. Gerstner	<i>Donald P. Buteyn</i>	58
Western Asceticism, edited by Owen Chadwick	<i>Wallace N. Jamison</i>	59
A Message to Catholics and Protestants, by Oscar Cullman; Interpreting Protestantism to Catholics, by Walter R. Clyde; Understanding Roman Catholicism, by Winthrop Hudson	<i>Elton M. Eenigenburg</i>	60
Ecumenism and the Evangelical, by J. Marcellus Kik	<i>Garret Wilterdink</i>	62
Counseling for Church Vocations, by Samuel Southard	<i>A. A. Dykstra</i>	63

BOOK NOTES

Basic Beliefs of the Reformed Faith, by Felix B. Gear	<i>M. E. Osterhaven</i>	64
All the Way to Calvary, by Ona E. Hall	<i>Jacob Prins</i>	64
Christians Alive, by Bryan Green	<i>Jacob Prins</i>	64
The Praying Christ, by James G. S. S. Thomson	<i>Jacob Prins</i>	65
Fundamentalism and Evangelism, by John R. W. Stott	<i>J. Robert Steegstra</i>	65
Tracts and Treatises on the Reformation of the Church, by John Calvin	<i>Elton M. Eenigenburg</i>	66
If I Believe, by Donald J. Campbell	<i>Herbert S. Van Wyk</i>	66
When Trouble Comes, by James E. Sellers	<i>Herbert S. Van Wyk</i>	66
Organized for Action, by Guido A. Merckens	<i>Chester J. Droog</i>	67
Sermons in Stories for Children, by Graham R. Hodges	<i>Edward H. Tanis</i>	67
Strange Altars, by J. W. Acker	<i>Edward H. Tanis</i>	68
You Can Have a New Life, by Everett W. Palmer	<i>Henry A. Mouw</i>	68

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Elton M. Eenigenburg	Marvin Hoff	Henry A. Mouw
Lester J. Kuyper	William Van Malsen	Raymond E. Beckering
Lambert J. Ponstein	Robert De Young	Henry J. Ten Clay
	William Unzicker	

Subscription Price: \$2.00 per year

Single Copies, 50 cents

71094

APR 16 1980

ON WEARING CHRIST'S YOKE

HAROLD N. ENGLUND

"Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me." Matthew 11:29

Come with me to Monte Cassino, Benedictine monastery situated atop a hill between Rome and Naples. The time is the sixth century of the Christian era.

Here is located the fellowship of the Christianly serious, for the most part laymen, who live under the fatherly Rule developed by Benedict of Nursia. Why have these brothers come to Monte Cassino? To pursue holiness through prayer and disciplined living.

The Rule given by Benedict¹ is not intended to be severe, nor even particularly demanding. He calls it "a minimum," "a little rule for beginners in the spiritual life." There is nothing "rough or burdensome," save only the natural resistance of the flesh to the growth of obedience, humility, and patience. There is no deliberate effort involving physical mortification.

The day's activities begin at Monte Cassino with the ringing of a bell at two o'clock in the morning. The brothers rise from sleep, the alert ones "softly exhorting" their sleepier comrades. And a few moments later we can see the assembled company in the chapel reciting the night office by flickering candlelight.

After a period of silence for the reading of the Scriptures and prayer, the brothers join once more in celebrating Lauds at dawn and Prime at sunrise.

God gave daylight for work, so from Prime until the first and main meal of the day, served anywhere from noon to three o'clock, the brothers work in the fields or kitchens or shops of the monastery, taking care to observe the hours of Terce, Sext and None in the chapel. In the afternoon there is more work, or further reading, until Vespers. A light supper, followed by Compline in chapel, ends the day.

All in all, the brothers spend about three and a half hours in worship at the seven offices, or services; four and a half hours in reading or meditation; an hour for food; eight and a half hours for sleep; and six and a half hours for work in the fields.

¹Owen Chadwick, tran., *Western Asceticism*, Vol. XII Library of Christian Classics (London: SCM Press, 1958) pp. 290-337.

For the guidance of the monastery, Benedict presents his Rule in seventy-three sections. One of these sections offers seventy-four regulations for conduct, or "instruments of good works." These regulations are really guides for the development of personal piety in the context of group living. He begins, "First, to love the Lord God with all the heart, with all the soul, and with all the strength." And he ends, "And never to despair of God's mercy." With keen insight into human nature, he cautions against laziness, sleepiness, evil thoughts, pride, and loud laughter, with a special warning against grumbling.

Benedict is anxious to teach the brothers how to pray, how to sing in chapel, how to take care of the monastery's tools, how to sleep (with knives laid aside so as not to hurt themselves on being abruptly aroused by the night bell!), and how to behave themselves in doing work in the kitchen. The whole Rule is practical if it is anything.

A "minimum," says Benedict. "A little rule for beginners in the spiritual life." And the light that burns on Monte Cassino is soon carried to France, to Spain, and to England. Between the years 520 and 1005, over 15,000 abbeys are established in Western Europe by the Benedictine order alone. The role of these brothers in the Christianizing of Europe is beyond estimation.

Thus did some Christians in some centuries understand and apply our Lord's invitation to accept his yoke.

We are not Benedictine brothers, and we have come to look more to Geneva than to Monte Cassino for our inspiration and example. But our age resembles both the time of Benedict and the time of Calvin. As at the end of the early Christian-Roman era, and as at the end of the medieval period, so today there is disintegration in the air. A five hundred-year old Renaissance humanism is crumbling. An old order is dying, and it is not yet clear what is to take its place. Barbarian nations are again arising entirely outside Christendom. Is it not a sign of the times that the non-Christian Afro-Asian bloc of nations can now outvote the so-called Christian West in the United Nations? Christendom's long stewardship of world power, continuing since Constantine at Milvian Bridge, is apparently ending.

Once again the Christianly serious are straining to hear the voice of the Lord of the Church giving his orders. And among these Christianly serious, please God, are you young men who seek to prepare yourselves for the Gospel ministry.

But let it be said plainly in a self-indulgent age which knows nothing of Benedict's Rule or any other Rule, an age anaesthetized by comforts and pleasures and material well-being, that Christ's ministry today, as always, means putting on a yoke. This yoke involves discipline, Rule,

obedience, servanthood. A yoke, after all, is not a pretty ornament worn around the neck; it is a piece of wood hollowed out for the shoulders, laid across the back to enable one to carry a heavy burden.

To be sure, today's theologs should have a strongly felt commitment. They should also have a clear understanding of Christ's absolute mercy and absolute demand. But just now we are concerned most about the training of the will, the long pull, the putting of the hand to the plough and not turning back, the stern disciplines of discipleship, the gradual formation of Christ in the Christian minister, and the subjugation of the self to the Master.

* * *

Let me present some aspects of this yoke in terms of three paradoxes. The first one is this: that Christ's yoke requires *detachment from the world*, and at the same time it requires *participation in the world*.

The brothers at Monte Cassino saw clearly the need for detachment. Their withdrawal was a courageous renunciation of the values and goals of a society that was moving away from God. The sensuality and corruption of Roman life repelled them, and their hunger for holiness drew them to the hill of St. Benedict.

But is life in today's America so congenial to the Christian heart that the call to detachment is no longer relevant? This is an aspect of the ministry that needs re-emphasizing. Without intending it, or even knowing it, the minister of the Gospel has become partly enslaved to our culture. He has come to glory in how similar he can be to the man on the street. In his conversation, humor, attitudes to material possessions, and motivation, there is too often little that advertises whose he is and whom he serves.

In our concern with methods of church administration we have forgotten the hard disciplines of prayer and contemplation. In our desire to provide economic security for the ministry, we have overlooked the fact that we walk in the footsteps of One who never knew anything but poverty. In our training we stress what we are to do before men, but we often ignore the much harder calling of what we are to be before God. And in our much talk about rendering service, we have not seriously faced up to what it actually means to be a servant.

To those aspiring to wear Christ's yoke, the New Testament speaks plainly: "Be not conformed to this world." "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world." "Because ye are not of the world, therefore the world hateth you." All this is clearer in Hungary and Czechoslovakia and East Germany than it is here. Well did Dietrich Bonhoeffer warn against "cheap grace!" Well did he remind us of "costly obedience!"

"Take my yoke upon you and learn of me." For our sakes Christ sanctified himself, set himself apart. His detachment was total. He was not "of the world." And finally he hung upon a Cross, where the world which could not control him, nor mold him, nor silence him, nor make him echo its own voice, killed him.

Our detachment is not the physical apartness of the anchorites, nor the social apartness of the Vicar of Wakefield. It is rather that sanctifying of the total self in response to Christ's call. It is not just a moving away from conformity to this world; it is a moving toward the Lord.

Yet *detachment* cannot stand alone. It is "on the one hand." And there is an opposite demand "on the other hand." We are also called to *participation* in the life of the world. And it is right here that we feel something missing at Monte Cassino. The brothers at the abbey were assembled not to render service to mankind, but to pursue holiness in isolation from mankind.

But the Church was not given for its own sake; it was given for the sake of the world. Detachment is an echo of the Atonement; participation is an echo of the Incarnation. Neither can stand without the other.

Even as the only way holiness could be mediated to an unholy world was by God becoming involved in the sinful life of mankind, so the only way the Church can extend Christ's ministry in this age of the Spirit is by perpetuating his involvement in the human situation. At this point, the Church today needs the leadership of her pastors.

But to what degree does the Church of today participate in the common life and institutions of mankind? Is not the Church largely living out its whole life — worship, instruction, fellowship — in isolation from society? What is the most serious charge laid at the Church's door today? Not heresy, but irrelevance! The monastery walls are no longer visible, but they are still there! Christians retreat from a contaminated society into their holy fellowship, where they perform certain rites and speak a special language largely unintelligible to the uninitiated. Service becomes an interior arrangement in the club, whereby members engage in a frenetic round of time-consuming activities for the benefit of one another. Jesus was once criticized for having dinner in the house of Zacchaeus, a disreputable collaborator. We ministers are in little danger of such a criticism, for at the limit, we would have no occasion ever to enter such a man's house. There is too much to be done in the monastery.

Without a doubt the replacement of the medieval "parish" system by the modern "gathered church" has contributed to the Church's sin of feeling responsible only for its own members. Once again we need to recover some sense of the Church-in-place, of a congregation related to a

geographic area, and concerned for the totality of human need in precisely that area.

Detachment and participation do not fight. Rightly understood, each promotes the other. The pastor who really becomes involved in his community's life will have to become the Lord's in a profound sense in order to bring the life of God into the life of the community. And the yoke-wearing servant of Christ who is truly detached, not only from the world but unto the Lord, is the very man who is most likely to feel the sins, the sorrows, the aspirations, the bitternesses, the yearnings of the hearts around him. On the other hand, the conformist cannot really put his heart into the world, for there is too much of the world in his heart.

* * *

A second paradox of Christ's yoke is that *it requires servitude*, and yet *it promises freedom*.

To us who are children of the twentieth century, pampered by creature comforts, the brothers at Monte Cassino seem to have been in a sort of religious prison. Nor is the place any less forbidding because they asked to enter it. Think of it: chapel seven times a day, beginning at two o'clock in the morning, and every day of one's life! Or think of the seventy-four goals of piety given by St. Benedict!

But why stumble at the Rule of the Benedictines? Go back to the New Testament. Read again its commands. Underline them. There are more than seventy-four. Some concern outward deportment. But the most demanding of them concern the activity of the mind and the attitude of the heart.

"Whoever looks upon a woman to lust after her is guilty of adultery in his heart."

"Whoever hates his brother is a murderer."

"Whoever harbors an unforgiving spirit shall have no forgiveness."

These few are from our Lord. Now add the imperatives of St. Paul, who tells us that he kept his body in subjection, lest having announced the Christian race to others, he should himself be disqualified.

"Leading every thought into captivity," he writes, "to the obedience of Christ."

"Do all things without grumbling or complaining."

"Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ."

The yoke is a symbol of our servant status. We are God's domestics in the household of faith. D. T. Niles of Ceylon has helped us see the gap between merely rendering service and regarding oneself as a servant.² Hard as it may be on our aspiring egos, we are called to put on a yoke of servitude.

²D. T. Niles, *The Preacher's Calling to be Servant*, (New York: Harper, 1959).

I am well aware that this is not the first century, nor is Western Seminary Monte Cassino. But the yoke of Christ's ministry still involves the voluntary submission of the total being to Christ's present demands. These present demands will come to you through those whom the Lord has appointed in his Church to be your teachers and guides. If this position proves to be an exercise in humility, then know that this is part of the meaning of your consecration. You cannot be consecrated in the future tense. Either you are presently obedient, or you are not consecrated.

What are Christ's present demands? That you labor over Hebrew paradigms, and wrestle with dogmatics, and struggle to grasp the significance of church history, and seek the face of God both privately, and corporately in chapel once a day, if not seven times. Other service will come later. This service is required now. And in giving service to Christ as Lord, it is well to remember that the Lord loves a cheerful giver.

But more: there is the formation of the person of the minister — the building of Christlike attitudes, the acquiring of self-mastery in the use of the tongue, the patient building of patience, the practice of unfailing courtesy, the daily renewal of the decision to be Christ's bonds slave, and the importing into all of Seminary life the qualities of joy and earnestness.

This all adds up to servitude of a very profound sort. "We are not our own but belong to our faithful Savior Jesus Christ." The Lordship of Christ is totalitarian beyond anything Hitler ever imagined. If you consider the cost too high and wish to settle for easier terms, there are none.

Yet this *servitude* brings real *freedom*. The saints of all ages agree on this point. And I am not now speaking of the freedom we have in Christ by God's justifying grace, but that which is a fruit of the Spirit's sanctifying power. We are free. We also become free. An illustration will clear up the manner in which obedience brings freedom.

Have you ever watched a great pianist at the keyboard? How effortless is his playing! How abandoned he is to his task of interpreting the mind of the composer! But effortlessness is purchased at the price of effort. A demanding regimen of practice hours over many years lies behind the artist's freedom on the instrument. One can forget technique only when one has acquired it. Acquired technique liberates. This is true in music, in baseball, in reading the Greek New Testament, and in prayer.

Diligence in Seminary leads to freedom in the ministry. When the yoke fits and is properly worn, you can carry a heavy load without discomfort. Jesus promised, "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light," but only after he said, "Learn of me." The learning requires sustained effort, but the promised lightness of the load is worth it.

In the deepest sense, our servitude to Christ frees us to become what God intends we should be. "His service is perfect freedom." When our lives are unfulfilled, it is because we have forged our own chains through disobedience and insubordination.

Make me a captive, Lord, and then I shall be free;

Force me to render up my sword, and I shall conqueror be.

* * *

Let me mention one further paradox in wearing Christ's yoke. Exclusion is necessary to find fulfillment. In order to enter the Gospel ministry you had to make a series of choices. But each choice was not only saying "Yes" to one of a cluster of alternatives; it was also saying "No" to all the rest. Each decision was both an affirmation and an exclusion. With Robert Frost, you walked one day in a wood and took one path rather than the other, and "this has made all the difference."

Professor Tillich in one of his sermons³ has called our attention to this dimension of tragedy in decision-making. Many of life's possibilities must be forfeited in order that a few may be actualized. Yet these possibilities really belong to us when we are young; they are part of us. So we must choose a number of partial deaths in order to reach the goal God has marked out for us.

Some of you might have become scientists, or businessmen, or attorneys, or physicians. You believe God has called you to be Christian ministers. The other possibilities must now be courageously renounced in order that you may wear this particular yoke. Exclusion is the path to fulfillment.

The fruitless branch in the Vine is pruned. Yet this much is to be expected. But the fruit-bearing branch is also pruned. Why? Is this judgment? No, it is God's provision whereby more fruit and better fruit may appear in the life.

I remember a large apricot tree in the garden of my boyhood home. Every year hundreds of tiny cots would form on the branches, many more than the tree could ever develop. So buckets of tiny cots had to be taken off the tree and destroyed in order that those which remained could grow and mature.

To wear the yoke of the Christian ministry you will have to lay aside many quite legitimate plans and dreams and activities. You can't do everything in just one lifetime. Many partial deaths are called for. Many exclusions must be willingly made. Now that you have heard the Lord say, "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me," nothing can be allowed to interfere — no other interest, no other person. Like a river, your life

³Paul Tillich, *The Shaking of the Foundations*, (New York: Scribner's, 1948) pp. 173-186.

must now narrow into a channelled purpose in order to have power. But this narrowing is only a following after the Son of Man, whose whole life was narrowed down to the single purpose of our redemption, until at the end he gave back to God life itself as an atonement for our sins.

* * *

The man who wished to enter Monte Cassino was not admitted lightly. He was examined, proved, trained over a period of many months, warned of the discipline and hardship which lay ahead. Finally he was asked to profess publicly before the brothers his stability, amendment of life, and obedience. This promise was then written out in his own hand and by his own hand placed upon the altar with this prayer: "Receive me, O Lord, according to thy Word, and I shall live, and let me not be disappointed of my hope." The whole community then repeated this prayer and ended by singing the *Gloria*. And after asking the prayers of the company, the new brother entered the group.

You gentlemen will be trained, proved, and examined for three years in this school. At the end, if you persevere, you will be asked to profess your commitment to Christ as Lord and subscribe it with your own hand as you enter the Gospel ministry. We shall join you in praying that you may not be disappointed of your hope.

THE PROTESTANT APPROACH TO ROMAN CATHOLICISM

JOHN H. KROMMINGA

The opportunity to address the faculty and student body of Western Theological Seminary is a very welcome one indeed*. Exchanges such as this have proved very profitable in the past, and they should certainly be continued. For this occasion I have chosen to speak on a problem which concerns all of us together. It is too big a problem to settle in an hour's lecture. It is, in fact, bigger than the combined intelligence represented here, and this is said without insult to anyone. But it is our aspiration at least to make an intelligent approach to the problem.

I AN IMPORTANT SUBJECT

It certainly is no rarity today that a Protestant should be speaking about Roman Catholicism. If articles on the subject of Protestant-Catholic relationships are deemed fit material for the *Reader's Digest*, *Time*, and the local newspapers, they certainly are not out of place in a theological seminary. The possibility of seeing a Roman Catholic nominated to the presidency of the United States is very much in the news. This raises all sorts of questions about the relation of religion to politics and the relation of church to state. These questions will not down. The more vigorously it is asserted that they have no place in an American political campaign, the more persistently they raise their heads. I will not attempt to answer the questions. I am satisfied to aver that granting the existence of the American answer to the church-state problem and the existence of certain papal utterances on the subject of church and state, the questions are legitimate and proper. There is about them nothing un-American, un-democratic, un-Christian, or unfair.

The question of the Protestant approach to Roman Catholicism is, however, of much greater concern than the passing flurry of interest in a political campaign. This subject belongs here rather because we are Protestant Christians than because we are Americans or Republicans or Democrats. Our subject concerns eternal salvation rather than temporal welfare. It concerns the kingdom of God rather than the American state. It concerns abiding divine truth rather than current governmental theory.

*This paper was presented at the seminary on the morning of April 28th.

These considerations make it a most important subject, and certain other considerations make it a very crucial and timely subject also.

Politically speaking, one might say that we ought all to stand together as good Americans in this time of international crisis, and therefore our questions ought to be settled once and for all. But it would be even more to the point to argue that we ought all to stand together as good Christians—not in America only, but all over the world—in the church's time of crisis, and that therefore the religious questions ought to be settled once and for all.

Difficult or impossible as the answer may be to the questions here posed, this is the true measure of the importance of this subject. Its significance is derived from dangers without and within which threaten the very existence, and certainly the welfare, of the Christian Church. From without come the tidings of resurgent paganism and revived ethnic religions, uniting their forces with rising nationalism throughout the world. The medieval heresy of Islam may seem like a remote force to many of us, but it is a real and potent challenge to Christianity in many parts of the world. (Let us not forget, when we say that, that the Christian world today is as much "one world" as the secular world. As never before in human history, what happens anywhere in the world is of vital and immediate importance to us.) From without comes also the strident challenge of Communism, in control of much of the earth's surface and vast numbers of her people, and poised to strike anywhere else where any flaw in the armor of resistance is revealed.

All of this would be serious enough if it were opposed by a solid phalanx of Christian nations, Christian peoples, Christian churches, and Christian doctrines. But this, alas, is far from being the case. It is not, at the moment, the divisions of Christendom into three major and many minor factions of which I am speaking, although that situation makes its sorry contribution to our dilemma. It is rather the unavoidable fact that the nations and societies of the world have adopted a secular outlook on life. Whether this be an attitude of vigorous opposition or of indifference to revealed truth does not make a great deal of difference. This is a secularism which has dominated philosophy, which has seized control of education, and which has penetrated deeply into the churches themselves. This secularism combines with a materialistic outlook on life which is practised by both Christians and non-Christians. It reflects itself in the statistical fact that in the exploding population in this world the non-Christians are outdistancing the Christian advance. The Church of Jesus Christ is losing the population race.

The Catholics have long maintained that this secularization all stems from the Protestant break with mother Church. The important fact today

is not so much that they are wrong in this charge as that they can no longer afford the luxury of this mistaken position. The Protestant answer has often been to act as if the secularization did not exist or was not dangerous. This was never true; but the important thing is that today it is not even sufficient to point to the influence of the Renaissance as the root of our troubles. This polemic is too costly to maintain merely as a polemic. If it is to remain, it must do so as an attempt to answer the question what our proper relationship should be to each other in the face of the danger which threatens us both.

The conclusion is this: if the world-wide struggle for the souls of men is not to be lost, we must consider carefully whether we and the Catholics do not ultimately stand on the same side in that struggle. What is it that separates us? Is that separation irremediable? It is to the dimensions of that question that we now turn.

II A COMPLEX SITUATION

The problem of Protestant-Catholic relationships is exceedingly complex. To describe points of contact or points of attack is something like trying to imagine a boxing match between two jellyfish. Both parties to the dispute find it almost as difficult to identify themselves as to analyze their opponents. Since any intelligent approach to each other must recognize this complexity, let us note a few elements of it. Many as we shall see them to be, we must also bemoan the fact that there are many more than those we shall mention.

On the Protestant side, in the first place, there are many divisions into separate churches, with little or no contact with each other and with no unified voice. The national churches and the denominational organizations, however, would be a relatively minor problem if it were not for the genuine differences in outlook which separate them. The liberal-conservative opposition is a matter of basic differences within Protestantism, and it is no respecter of national or denominational boundaries. There have been differences in the attitudes of Protestants to tradition ever since the Reformation. The Anglican, Calvinist, Lutheran, and Anabaptist answers to this question make any unified Protestant tradition very difficult to identify. Contemporary attitudes to the creeds, the fathers, and the traditions vary just as widely. The handiest point of reference is the creeds of the church. Some adhere faithfully, and even rigidly, to these creeds. Some pay them lip service only, as to fine historic statements which have lost their binding force. Others are opposed on principle to any creed. Even the designation "Bible-believing" does not solve this problem. Where and how, in this welter of confusion with respect to the creeds, is Protestantism to find a platform from which to evaluate, let alone approach, Catholicism?

To mention but one more element of diversity, the Protestant evalua-

tion of Holy Scripture is hopelessly confused. Some Protestants subscribe to the inspiration of the Scriptures and to the divine authority which stems from that inspiration. Others reject inspiration and authority alike. And today we see an attempt to reinterpret inspiration and to recapture authority on this new basis. Among those who hold to the Scriptures, some interpret them poetically, some literally, some figuratively. If the Protestant principle of *sola Scriptura* is to be the platform for the approach, some Protestants had better return to that platform, and the rest had better decide what they mean by it.

This must suffice to indicate Protestant diversity, not because it is anywhere near exhaustive, but because this aspect of the problem is probably more familiar to us than the other. There is within Catholicism also a surprising and bewildering diversity. This constitutes a problem for Catholics themselves, but even more for the Protestant who seeks to understand this massive system from the outside. It is a fact not well known, and certainly not widely publicized, that there are deep and wide differences between Franciscans, Dominicans, and Jesuits as to their theological emphases. Actually these groups have less in common with each other than do many Protestant sects. There is also a geographical diversity. Many Protestants take Spanish Catholicism as Exhibit A in demonstrating the kind of church Catholicism produces if left to itself; but many Catholics wash their hands of developments in Spain. The Catholic Church in the United States is almost unrecognizable as the counterpart of the Catholic Church in, let us say, Bolivia. In France, we are told, the principal emphasis of the average priest is on being a pastor to his flock. In Italy it is on the fine art of governing the church. And so the diversities multiply.

There is an even more significant diversity which calls for mention. The church is so vast that there is no possibility of imposing absolute uniformity on its theologians in their views. Thus from time to time views are advanced which have a promising sound. To mention a few, there has been in recent years a revival of sound biblical studies, a renewed interest in historical studies, a reinterpretation of the Reformation, and a movement advocating wide-scale reform in liturgical theory and practice. Besides this, there are recurrent attempts to determine how dogma progresses in the life of the church.

Many of these developments look very promising indeed for the emergence of intelligent and profitable conversations between Catholics and Protestants. But there is one glaring flaw in the picture. Every last one of these elements and inquiries is subject to the unquestioned and presumably infallible authority of the mother Church. Theologians, philosophers, liturgists, and everything else down to worker priests, are given a seeming latitude until their movement becomes significant enough to call

for an official pronouncement. When that pronouncement has been given, they may twist and squirm, but eventually they must submit to authority—and that, according to official definition, not with a grudging submission, but with the full consent of the conscience. In spite of all the promising movements and theories, the tendency at Trent and ever since, has been toward more, not less, of a straight jacket.

The Protestant observer finds it very difficult to determine when he is confronting the real Catholic Church. What he observes in the practices of his Catholic neighbors seems to move on a much lower level of respectability than what he reads in the books of the Catholic theologians. Now this is true to a certain extent of Protestants also, but to nowhere near the same extent. The absurdity which Protestants think to find in the dogma of papal infallibility is somewhat lessened when Catholics explain how carefully the infallibility of the pope is circumscribed. But if at the same time the Catholic layman wishes to believe that the pope makes infallible utterances every time he opens his mouth, little is done to disabuse him of this notion. Theologians carefully explain that what is given to the Virgin Mary is veneration, not adoration; but they seem to be much more concerned that this distinction be recognized by Protestant critics than by Catholic believers.

What is true of the Catholic layman is true also, though to a lesser degree, of the official Catholic theology and its interpretation by Catholic theologians. There is widespread difference of opinion among theologians as to the exact extent of the decree of papal infallibility. Is an encyclical letter infallible, or is it not? There is difference of interpretation as to the exact meaning and official character of what Pius IX said on democracy and the separation of church and state, in the famous Syllabus of Errors. Illustrations of this could be multiplied. The Roman Catholic Church makes what it considers to be infallible dogmatic pronouncements. But it is willing to play by ear the variations on these themes. The hierarchy is willing to follow the course of expediency in this respect. There is in the Catholic Church a deliberate vagueness in the midst of infallible pronouncements and a purposeful latitude in the midst of enforced uniformity which are baffling to the Protestant mind.

It is not our purpose at this point, or anywhere in this present discussion, to examine and criticize the points which have been made. Important and profitable though this would be, it is our purpose only to indicate how complex the questions are. We must see clearly how complex the situation is, how much in danger we are of misunderstanding ourselves and each other, and how much rubbish has to be cleared away on all sides before any significant conversations can be held with each other.

III DEEP CLEAVAGES

The next massive fact which emerges from our consideration is that there is "a great gulf fixed" between Catholicism and Protestantism. No honest conversation between the two parties can ignore or obscure that fact. Protestants confront in Catholicism not merely a difference in theological theories or emphases, but a vastly different way of life, a different way of faith, a different mentality. Professor George Tavard, eloquent spokesman for Catholicism, recognizes this in his book *The Catholic Approach to Protestantism*. In a chapter entitled "Boldness Yesterday" he notes the grandiose schemes for Protestant-Catholic reunification which were advanced, only to prove failures, in the past. He contrasts with this the "Prudence Today" which dictates that a careful and painstaking approach be made to the deep cleavages which exist.

The point of deepest cleavage lies in the conception of religious authority. The great gap between the Reformers and the Catholic hierarchy on this score has been widened, not narrowed, between the Reformation and the present. The Catholic Church before the Reformation was not clear on the question of authority. The acceptance of biblical authority and the growth of canonical tradition existed side by side without any clear recognition of their inevitable rivalry with each other. Martin Luther was acting as a perfectly good Catholic when he studied the Word of God. But in the course of his studies, intensified as they were by the struggles of his conscience, the incompatibility between the Word of God and burgeoning human tradition became apparent, and, becoming apparent, became intolerable. Without rejecting the wisdom of the Fathers, he determined that for him all Fathers and all councils and all traditions had to be subjected to the criterion of the Word of God. In this sense *sola Scriptura* became the watchword of the Reformers.

The hope that this principle would be adopted by the Catholic Church was dashed forever at the Council of Trent. Recognizing the crucial significance of the source of authority, the Council early directed its attention to this problem. At its fourth session, April 8, 1546, the council decided that Scripture and Tradition were alike sources of dogma, and that the Scriptures were not to be interpreted in any other sense than that which had been adopted by holy mother Church. Now that which had been a commonly held opinion became for the first time in history official Church law. The doom of Protestant-Catholic reconciliation was sealed at this point. Here we see the depth of the cleavage. Until one party or the other repudiates its conception of religious authority there can be no reconciliation between them. And when either party makes such a repudiation it will have ceased to exist.

In its definition of papal infallibility the Vatican Council of 1870

greatly widened the gap. The Catholic historian Döllinger argued that this doctrine was contrary to Scripture, to tradition, to history, and to reason. Various bishops also fought vigorously against the declaration at the Council, but to no avail. The infallibility of the Church had now been removed one step farther away from any responsibility to the Scripture or even to the consensus of the Christian community.

How serious this was may be seen from the earlier promulgation, in 1854, of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. In taking this step, Pope Pius IX assumed papal infallibility in practice before it had been defined in theory. He made little pretense of establishing the dogma concerning Mary on Scriptural arguments. Even more significantly, he did not attempt to show that this had been "always" believed, but was satisfied with the assurance that it had been generally held for the preceding three centuries.

Catholics hold that original revelation passed through two streams—Scripture and unwritten tradition—to the teaching Church. Of those two streams, tradition is by far the larger. This already sets it practically, though not formally, above the Bible as a source of doctrine. Furthermore, for the Catholic layman, and even for the priest, the practical rule of faith is neither the Bible nor tradition, but the teaching Church. The last link in this iron chain is the consideration that for the Catholic the teaching Church is not only the proximate, but the ultimate source of authority. It is the Church, in the last analysis, which determines not only the meaning of Scripture, but the content of authentic tradition as well. Any Protestantism which weakens its opposition to that system has ceased to be worthy of the name. And the Church which adopts this position has lost its responsiveness to divine guidance at the very point at which it asserts its highest claims to that guidance.

We do not have time to examine with equal care the other basic cleavages which exist. We must, however, mention two of them in passing. The cleavage which exists in respect to the formal Reformation principle of reliance on Scripture is matched in respect to the material doctrines which result. On the question of *sola fide*, *sola gratia*, there has been a measure of misunderstanding and misinterpretation from both sides, but the difference is nonetheless real and profound. It involves, in fact, the whole doctrinal system. Even incidental differences, when closely examined, prove to be integral parts of the system. Mariolatry, sacramental grace, the identity of Christ with the Church, the conception of merit, and many other items all fall into place. Dr. Berkouwer has clearly demonstrated this inner coherence of the two systems and their opposition to each other at point after point. His analysis in *The Conflict With Rome*, incidentally, has been recognized by Catholic authorities as

factually correct. There is, let it be recognized, a large measure of agreement between Catholicism and Reformation Protestantism on theology and Christology. But this is vitiated by wide differences on anthropology, soteriology, and ecclesiology.

Correlative with the differences mentioned is one more, the Protestant principle of the priesthood of all believers. This, too, has often been misrepresented and overdrawn. But the fact remains that Catholicism presupposes and requires a submission to a proximate authority which is vastly different from the Protestant's expectation of conviction of conscience resulting from his study of the Word of God. The relation to the truth on the parts of these two parties is so different as to suggest that they must be basically different men to enter into these relations.

IV SUGGESTED LINES OF APPROACH

In view of all of these complicating factors, is it possible to do any justice to our title? Is any Protestant approach to Roman Catholicism possible? Is it even permissible? We will conclude with a few suggestions on this point.

Conversations and cooperation between Protestants and Roman Catholics attracted renewed attention in Europe during the Second World War. Such practical cooperation as resulted from the distress which the war brought to members of both faiths produced literary monuments. One of the most important of these is Karl Adam's *Una Sancta*. A current reflection of this kind of thinking is found in Oscar Cullmann's suggestion that each group should contribute to the benevolent work of the other. Another type of approach between the two groups is represented by Jaroslav Pelikan's *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism* on the one hand and George Tavard's *Holy Writ or Holy Church* on the other. Here it is suggested on the one hand that Protestants ought to be more appreciative of tradition and liturgy, and on the other hand that there is something relative about the decisions of the Council of Trent. Another type of approach is represented by Dr. Berkouwer, who sets out to examine the differences and clear away the misconceptions without surrendering an ounce of principle. His work has met with an answer by a panel of Roman Catholic scholars in a volume entitled *Genade en Kerk*. The World Council of Churches has been accused of building a bridge by which Protestants will return to Rome. I am not in a position to judge the validity of this accusation, but I know of no reason to accept it as true. Finally, Pope John XXIII has excited the Christian world by suggesting the summoning of a truly ecumenical council at some time in the near future. Just what he means by this is not clear to the general public, and perhaps not fully clear to himself. If it does nothing else, however, it serves to indicate the great public interest in this subject.

How shall these various approaches be evaluated? A quick and off-hand evaluation is bound to be faulty, but we shall attempt it nevertheless. The suggestion that Protestants and Catholics should support each other's benevolent work certainly does not in itself answer the real problem and approaches it only obliquely at best. About the other proposals a few general remarks must suffice. It is to be suspected that such Catholic approaches to Protestantism as those of Professor Tavard and John XXIII seem to promise more than they are able to produce. On the other hand, the approach of Professor Pelikan seems to this commentator to surrender too much of Protestant conviction at the outset of the conversations. The approach of Dr. Berkouwer and others does not promise anything concrete and immediate, but if any approach is to be made, this painstaking, long-range conversation between the two parties seems to be the only one that will meet all demands.

It will be well to interject at this point the consideration that there are various levels of approach which are not to be confused with each other. A recent conference of Protestants on Roman Catholicism produced the observation that there are at least three such levels; the theological, the civic, and the evangelistic. The first concerns itself with theological differences and how to solve them. The second is concerned with the problem of meeting Catholic activity in civic affairs, either to combat it or to cooperate with it in the interests of common objectives. The third is the attempt to win Catholic laymen and priests for the Protestant faith. What we are concerned with here is the theological approach. But it ought to be observed that a willingness to enter into theological conversations with Roman Catholics does not imply that we may not at the same time combat certain Catholic civic activities or seek to bring about the conversion of Catholic priests or laymen. To put it concretely, the exchange of literary or verbal arguments on the theological level does not mean that there is no room for the activity of "Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State" in bringing pressure to bear on their objectives, or for Christ's Mission to bring an evangelistic approach to individual Catholics.

With that understanding, we propose that a willingness to enter into theological conversations is not in itself a sign of weakness or of softness, but rather a mark of strength. Protestants have two firm bases for such conversations; adherence to the authority of the Word of God and continuity with the doctrines of the ecumenical creeds of the first five Christian centuries. Not all Protestants share this position, and not all who hold these views hold them in the same way—it is this weakness of adherence to the position rather than any weakness in the position itself which constitutes Protestant weakness. The position itself is strong. Protestantism

itself, no matter what foe it faces, owes to itself and its Lord to return to this position as clearly and unequivocally as possible.

There is a promising point of contact for such an emphasis in the revival of biblical and historical studies within the Catholic Church. This promise must not be overestimated. No Roman Catholic worthy of the name is ready to repudiate the superiority of Church to individual study of the Scriptures. In the present circumstances anyone who would do that would thereby cease to be a Roman Catholic. But this is nevertheless the great ray of hope. For the Word of God is not bound, and if Protestants can encourage Catholic theologians to study it anew, they certainly ought to do so.

It would be a tragic error to suppose that anything can be accomplished overnight. Any approach which does not do justice to the deep cleavages must involve a denial of basic Catholic or Protestant positions. Anything which does do justice to these cleavages must reconcile itself to long, slow progress, if any. The approach must, I am convinced, be through the settlement of theological differences. Adoption of organizational unity at the expense of conviction would be a denial of the principle and power of the Reformation.

But if the looming threat of neo-paganism can be viewed as sufficient incentive for conversations, and if the professed adherence of both parties to the authority of the Word and the shared Christian conviction of the first five centuries can be seen as a sufficient basis, the Lord may yet be able to work a miracle of reconciliation. Let me make plain that I am not suggesting that Protestants be less Protestant than they are. On the contrary, I hold that they must recapture both the quality and the content of Reformation conviction. I am convinced that if basic change is to take place, it must take place within Catholicism. I do not suppose that this will happen quickly. I am not at all certain that it will ever happen. But if the door which was closed at Trent and locked at the Vatican Council can be opened just a trifle, the remote possibility of better understanding and healthful alteration exists. And while that possibility exists, the will of the Lord dictates that His servants should explore it.

PROGRAM OF ADVANCED RELIGIOUS STUDIES

PETER HSIEH

By the kindness of Rockefeller Foundation, a Program of Advanced Religious Studies (PARS) has been conducted for the last five years at Union Theological Seminary in New York City. It is a program of studies related to the ecumenical movement. I was very fortunate to be elected as one of the 25 for PARS 1959-60. A full report of the year's work will take too much space here. It was a very valuable year. Let me share with you two of the thoughts which come back to my mind very often since I came back from PARS.

In one of the seminars, Christian witness and the effort of exangelizing were being discussed. There were 23 "fellows" (members of PARS) present besides the directors. We were a group of men and women from 21 countries, with church traditions of high, low and free. Among the group there were school teacher, Archbishop, radio announcer, theological educators, S. C. M. secretary, principal and head-mistress of schools, missionaries, lay and ordained church personnel from different cultural background and different personal emphasis and inclinations in thoughts and opinions. It was a very serious discussion. Witness and evangelization are subjects very close to our hearts. Amidst the discussion, a quiet voice from the tiniest in size said, "Jesus never wrote a book but He lived." This simple statement and reminder temporarily stopped every voice. There was a profound and prolonged silence. We Christians discuss, write, read, organize, build, run meetings and conferences, preach, etc. Yet we still feel that the Church of Christ is very weak and inefficient, especially when the number of Christians is compared with the world population.

Moreover, in some areas people are anti-Christians. There are many reasons why people are against Christianity. One of the reasons is that people do not see in us much of the likeness of the God we talk about, which means we are disliked because we are hypocrites! Could it be that while we are so busily doing this and doing that we forget to *be* Christians or to live as Christians should? All the "churchy" things we do and the activities, directly or indirectly connected with theology in general, which we participate in are *meant* for witnessing and evangelizing. For some reason, these unfortunately have sometimes become

sources of friction, contention and disunity. We either become very unchristian while doing these things, because of a lack of love, of understanding and of appreciation, or we do these things as if they were ends in themselves. Sometimes all these activities are looked upon by non-Christians as pastimes or diversions for the kind of people who call themselves Christians and who are socially and economically classified as people of leisure. Leisure! Most of us will protest. But in the eyes of those whom we tried to evangelize, our hustle and bustle do not seem to have meaning or relevance to them. The *euaggelion* has not got across very well. Is it a matter of technique, language or living?

Every evening prayer was conducted by the "fellows" in PARS chapel. One evening the leader asked a question in connection with the motive of our zeal in our work. He asked, "Do we love Jesus more or do we love ourselves and whatever we identify ourselves with more?" What a subtle question! If the motive is self love, we can not be true Christians. If we are zealous because it is something we have identified ourselves with, then it is again self-love in a different appearance. None of us wants to say that he loves himself more; yet quite often we serve our Lord with mixed motives unawares. It is a fine distinction; yet it is an important distinction. All of us are engaged in kinds of work which we can say are for Christ. Nevertheless, it is important that we examine our motives from time to time. If we are zealous because what we do is what *we* are doing instead of what Christ wants us to do, we run into at least two great dangers. One, we shall be in danger of using the name of Christ or the name of the Church for our "Ego." Two, we shall greatly distort the "image" of the Body of Christ, because it is filled with our likes and dislikes. Someday these dangers might cause us to hear the Lord Jesus say to us, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father, which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity" (Mt. 7:21-23).

I realize that these are questions to which no single final answer is possible. Yet no Christian can afford not to ask himself these questions if he is really concerned about the condition of *the* Church or the ecumenical movement.

ORIGINAL ARMINIANISM AND METHODISTIC ARMINIANISM COMPARED

JAMES MEEUWSEN

Like almost every other segment of Protestantism, Arminianism has had to submit to various divergent movements. The history of theology indicates that there has been an important deviation from the original position which was expounded by James Arminius and his immediate successors. This study is concerned with a comparison of the differences between original Arminianism and that very well-known deviation, Methodistic Arminianism.¹

I

The first consideration is that of the difference between the Arminian theory of original sin and the Methodist theory. "Arminian anthropology accepts the doctrine of Adamic unity, and states it in substantially the same phraseology with the Lutheran and Calvinistic symbols, but it explains the phraseology very differently from them."² The truth of this statement is substantiated in Arminius' conception of the fall of the first man. In good Calvinistic form, Arminius attributed the sin of Adam to disobedience. Essentially it was a denial of one's subjection to God and a willful renunciation of obedience to him. Adam's sin was a transgression of the law by which man fell under the wrath and displeasure of God. "The efficient cause of that transgression was man, determining his will to that forbidden object, and applying his power or capability to do it."³ Because of this sin, our first parents suffered temporal death or the separation of body and soul; they suffered eternal death, or separation from God; and lastly, they suffered the punishment of guilt. Adamic unity involved all men in a similar experience because of Adam's sin.

The Arminians found it impossible to sever completely their relations with Calvinism. From the latter came the Arminian belief in a covenantal relationship between God and man. The condition of the covenant was that if man continued in the favor and grace of God by an unbroken

¹For the purpose of simplification, henceforth, original Arminianism will be referred to as Arminianism. Methodistic Arminianism will be referred to as Methodism.

²William G. T. Shedd, *A History of Christian Doctrine*, (New York: Scribner's, 1867), Vol. II, p. 179.

³James Arminius, *Works*, translated by James Nichols (Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1853), Vol. II, p. 74.

observance of the law, then the gifts conferred upon him would also be graciously transmitted to his posterity, through the efforts of divine grace. If man was in any way disobedient, he and also his posterity would be denied these gifts and would be liable to evil.⁴ This thinking provided a basis for original sin. Because our parents were unworthy, all men propagated from them in a natural way forfeited the particular blessings of God and became liable to temporal and eternal death. "The whole of this sin, however, is not peculiar to our parents . . . whatever punishment was brought down upon our parents, has likewise pervaded, and yet pursues all their posterity."⁵ Arminian phraseology exposed a definite similarity with Calvinism.

At what point can the Arminian concept of original sin be classified as contrary to Calvinistic total depravity and Adamic unity? Arminius makes the distinction between that which is called actual sin and that which was the cause of other sin. In this way Adamic unity is shattered. Arminius believed and confidently stated that God could not be angry with us on account of original sin which was born within us, since this would mean that God would be punishing us for that actual sin which was committed by Adam while in the garden. The sin which is derived from Adam is not actual sin, for only Adam can be accused of this.⁶ Original sin cannot be that actual sin through which Adam transgressed the law by partaking of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, but it is the guilt or corruption which proceeds from actual sin.

As to original sin, Arminius teaches that man, descending from Adam, has been corrupted by Adam's sin, but is not guilty. Adam was both guilty and corrupted. No one will ever be lost in perdition because of Adam's transgression, but all are in the bondage of corruption, because of the sin of the federal head.⁷

This approach implies that original sin is nothing more than a habit which was eventually acquired by man. The evil which has fallen upon man is a misfortune and the posterity of Adam are not truly guilty of the actual sin. There is a uniqueness about the sin committed by Adam in which none other is forced to share or experience. We share in the results of Adam's sin, but not in the sin itself. The sin of man is not such as "intrinsically merits eternal reprobation, so that God would have been just had he provided no redemption from it."⁸

Another crucial matter in this system is that of the imputation of Adam's sin. A later section will illustrate that Arminius is quite consis-

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 79.

⁵James Arminius, *Works*, Vol. I, p. 486.

⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 374-375.

⁷George L. Curtiss, *Arminianism in History* (New York: Hunt and Eaton, 1894), p. 12.

⁸William G. T. Shedd, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 181.

tent in his attitude concerning imputation, in both the imputation of Adam's sin and of Christ's righteousness. Arminius continually emphasized the heinousness of Adam's sin. It merited full punishment and because of it Adam experienced the full force of God's wrath. As stated before, Adam was both guilty and corrupted. Moreover, Arminius did seem to advocate a type of imputation to the posterity of Adam, which supported the thesis previously mentioned (note 2). This appears as imputation only in the sense that God has willed the descendants of Adam subject to the very same evil to which Adam subjected himself through willful participation in sin. It is sin only in so far as it is permitted evil. God allows an evil tendency to be imputed. This is the same as that which was inflicted upon the first man as punishment, but is transmitted to his posterity only in the form of a propagated evil and not as true punishment in any sense of the word. Shedd exposed the true nature of Arminian anthropology when he stated: "There is no ground for the assertion, that the sin of Adam was imputed to his posterity in the sense that God actually judged the posterity of Adam to be guilty of, and chargeable with, the same sin and crime which Adam had committed."⁹ The words of Arminius concerning the imputation of Adam's guilt to infants indicates that this conclusion by Shedd was no hollow statement.

When Adam sinned in his own person and with his free will, God pardoned that transgression. There is no reason then why it was the will of God to impute this sin to infants, who are said to have sinned in Adam, before they had personal existence, and therefore, before they could possibly sin at their own free will and pleasure.¹⁰

There is a definite distinction exhibited between the corruption of our nature and Adam's guilt. Arminius did not believe any man was condemned to eternal death because of the first sin. When confronted with the aspect of bodily death as a penalty for that sin, Arminius was forced to drive his position to an extreme point. He fell back upon the thought that Adam was created completely mortal, though death would not have been imminent, because of a certain divine prevention.¹¹

The reason for Arminius' denial of the imputation of guilt has its foundation in his attitude concerning the justice of God. Arminius and his followers held that the imputation of actual guilt was entirely contrary to the justice and equity of God. Shedd fully agreed with such an interpretation when he paraphrased their beliefs in this way: "Imputation is contrary to divine benevolence, right reason, in fact it is absurd and cruel."¹² Episcopius, a successor of James Arminius, presented an excellent summarization of the matter.

⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 183-184.

¹⁰James Arminius, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 319.

¹¹William G. T. Shedd, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 183.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 185.

Do not regard sin as sin properly so called, which renders the posterity of Adam deserving of the hatred of God; nor as an evil which by the method of punishment properly so called passes from Adam to his posterity; but as an evil, infirmity, injury, or by whatever name it may be called, which is propagated to his posterity by Adam devoid of original righteousness. Whence it results, that all the posterity of Adam, destitute of the same righteousness, are wholly unfit for, and incapable of attaining eternal life . . . But that original sin is not an evil in any other sense than this; — that it is not evil in the sense of implying guilt, because to be born is confessedly an involuntary thing, and therefore it is an involuntary thing to be born with this or that stain, infirmity, injury, or evil. But if it is not an evil in the sense of implying guilt, then it cannot be an evil in the sense of desert of punishment, because guilt and punishment are correlated. So far, therefore, as original sin is an evil, it must be in the sense in which the Remonstrants define the term; and is called original sin by a misuse of the word sin.¹³

The concept of original sin, as expounded by the Methodists, John Wesley and Richard Watson in particular, provides us with several significant changes. This view is so close to classic theology, i.e., that of Augustine, Luther, Calvin, etc., that many students of the movement are led to compare favorably the results with the formulations of John Calvin. Thus G. C. Cell writes ". . . how Wesley taught from first to last, and with all energy, the doctrine of original sin and total depravity. And he pushed this doctrine to the limit."¹⁴ The validity of this assertion will be tested in the following paragraphs.

The Methodist position on Adamic unity is developed according to a federal theology. Wesley came about as close to Calvin as one can without actually adopting the Calvinistic position. Wesley spoke about Adam as our representative.

My reason for believing that Adam is a federal head or representative of mankind is this: Christ was the representative of mankind, when God 'laid on him the iniquities of us all, and He was wounded for our transgressions'. But Adam was a type or figure of Christ; therefore, he was also, in some sense, our representative; in consequence of which, 'all died' in him as 'in Christ all shall be made alive.'¹⁵

Wesley inferred and advocated a rigid unity. It appeared as a radical departure from Arminianism. The meaning of Wesley's thoughts, as gathered from the context of his entire attitude, indicates that man's state is so dependent upon Adam, that by his first sin all men likewise fell into a state of sorrow, pain and death. Wesley would contend that Adam's sin was so serious that it brought condemnation to his posterity. He was

¹³*Ibid.*, p. 181. This quotation of Episcopius is one of the clearest and most concise in all Arminian writing.

¹⁴George Croft Cell, *The Rediscovery of John Wesley* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1935), p. 274.

¹⁵Robert W. Burtner and Robert E. Chiles, *A Compend of Wesley's Theology* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), p. 116.

quick to state that as sin entered into the world through our representative, so too death and all its attendants converged upon the world.¹⁶ The representative aspect, as it is set forth by Wesley, was much more inclusive and powerful than that of Arminius.

Richard Watson was not quite so bold as Wesley in his assertions. The representative phase, spoken of by Wesley as existing in a limited sense, was not accepted as a moral unity by Watson. "That Adam and his posterity constitute one moral person, and that the whole race was in him, its head, consenting to his act . . . is so little agreeable to that distinct agency which enters into the very notion of an accountable being, that it cannot be maintained . . ."¹⁷ This did not throw the Methodist conception back into the realm of Arminianism proper. It merely rejected the unity of moral substance and the fact that there was a unity of will, in the sense that we too sinned because our wills were one with Adam's will. There still remained a very real, objective, and significant relationship between Adam and all humanity. The relationship was of such a dynamic nature that we are completely involved in the results of Adam's sin. This notion became normative for most of Methodism. The theory concerning unity was certainly not absolutely identical with that of Calvinism, but it did have greater depth than the Arminian view. Both Wesley and Watson were completely capable of saying that we are guilty of eternal death. Arminius could only say that we possessed an evil tendency which would inevitably lead to death.

The effects of this sin upon man were explicated with little hesitation. Wesley and Watson turned away from Arminius at this point and entered into the periphery of historic theology. Their strongest and most convincing arguments were set forth in the area of total depravity or the effects of the first sin upon man. Opposition to Arminius was expressed in Watson's discussion on the status of infants.

For there is no more reason to conclude that those children who die in infancy were born with a pure nature, than they who live to manhood; and the fact of their being born liable to death, a part of the penalty, is sufficient to show they were born under the whole malediction.¹⁸

Wesley contended that man must sin, that he had absolutely no choice because of his totally corrupted nature. This sin spreads to the extent that it infects the entire man, leaving no part untouched. It is total corruption of man's inmost nature and expresses itself in every power and property contained by and within the soul. Man's will is completely distorted and perverted.¹⁹ Actually the difference in this area is quite clear.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, p. 114.

¹⁷Richard Watson, *Theological Institutes of Christianity* (New York: Lane and Scott, 1851), Vol. II, p. 53.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 58.

¹⁹R. W. Burtner and R. E. Chiles, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

Arminius has indicated that this sin refers only to an acquired habit, while the Methodists have declared this sin to be a totally perverse nature. One is capable of doing good, the other (without grace, which in reality is never the case) is bound entirely to that which is evil.

Upon first glance, it would appear that the Methodist position on imputation is quite in line with Arminian thought. Upon closer inspection it is concluded that it moves somewhere between Calvinism and Arminianism. The Methodist system seems to be more profound than the terminology would immediately indicate, although its attitude toward grace does much to neutralize the entire system. The distinction between actual sin and original sin was not so pronounced as was Arminius'. The difference between the two ideas on imputation can readily be seen by noting this characterization:

In what sense is Adam's sin imputed to mankind? In Adam all die, that is, 1.) Our bodies become mortal. (This is opposed to Arminius who believed that Adam was created mortal and only the preservation of God was lifted by sin) 2.) Our bodies died; that is, were disunited from God. And hence, 3.) we are all born with a sinful, devilish nature. By reason whereof, 4.) we are children of wrath, liable to death eternal.²⁰

Watson treads with considerable caution in his approach. He again takes some of the force from Wesley's evaluation, but by no means did he reject Wesley's position or his affinity with Arminian thought. Watson gave Methodism a place of mediation. He indicated that "... when the sin or righteousness of one person is said to be imputed to another, then generally those words mean only the result thereof; that is a liableness to punishment on the one hand, and to reward on the other."²¹ This sounds much like Arminianism; nevertheless, the end result is a doctrine similar to Wesley's. Watson acknowledged a death of the body due to Adam's sin. There is a spiritual death which makes the heart totally corrupt and naturally wicked and there is eternal death stemming from our federal head.²² The element of justice upon which Arminius based his denials of imputation has been noted. The later evangelicals also realized that justice was an integral aspect of the structure, but this attribute was never detrimental to their doctrinal construction. The justice of God can be found in the granting of free will to Adam. Adam was endowed with sufficient powers with which to resist sin. Justice did not become an obstruction to the ways of mercy, as in Arminianism. Original sin remained compatible with the justice of God.

These are some of the important principles upon which the doctrines have been constructed. The Arminians paid only lip service to Adamic unity. They asserted that original sin was an inherited evil tendency and

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 117.

²¹Richard Watson, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 54.

²²*Ibid.*, p. 55.

that the imputation of Adam's sin was unjust. Methodism believed in a representative anthropology, total inability or depravity, and a limited type of transference which was designated imputation.

II

At this point it would seem natural to consider the doctrine of grace which is the counterpart of the doctrine of sin. But before this can be fully understood, it is necessary to allude to the atonement, since the thinking on this matter partially conditions considerations on grace, justification, etc.

Arminius himself did not develop any particular theory of the atonement. The Grotian "governmental theory" of the atonement was the first Arminian attempt at a full diagnosis. It did not become the dominant Arminian attitude, but it did have a great influence on later formulations. One of the leading ideas in the governmental theory was the recognition of the nature of man's offence and the necessity for satisfaction. Christ was the true sacrifice in the sense that his penal example is sufficient to present complete satisfaction and to effect a reconciliation. This approach eliminated the concern for justice and replaced it with a satisfaction to God's honor. The only penal reference was that Christ takes on the suffering of the world while on the cross and by this action illustrates God's attitude toward sin. L. Berkhof presents a good summary of this position as it is related to penal justice.

He [Grotius] maintains that there is no dominant quality of distributive justice in God which demands that the requirements of the law be met in every particular, and which, in case of transgression, makes full satisfaction by punishment imperative. The law with which the sinner is concerned is not a transcript of the inherent righteousness of God, but a positive law (as opposed to natural law), a product of the Divine will, by which God is in no way bound and which he can alter or abrogate as He pleases. Both the law itself and its penalty can be modified or even abolished altogether by the Ruler of the universe.²³

The early Arminian conception of the atonement was partially derived from the governmental theory of Grotius, and partially from the combined efforts of Limborch and Curcellaeus. This refined theory embraced sacrificial offering as a leading idea, but a sacrifice that was not in the form of a payment of a debt, neither was it a complete satisfaction for justice. The central emphasis was that the sacrifice was a divinely-appointed condition which naturally preceded man's forgiveness from his sin.²⁴ The passion and death of Christ was not a substituted penalty, but in essence a substitute for a penalty. Shedd contributed three negative statements which clarify their position:

²³Louis Berkhof, *The History of Christian Doctrines* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949), p. 191.

²⁴Wm. G. T. Shedd, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 371.

1.) Christ did not endure the full penalty due to man, because he did not endure eternal death, either in degree or in time. 2.) If Christ had completely atoned for our sins by enduring the full penalty, then there is nothing more that Divine grace can do for us. . . . (they continually express a fear that Christ's death will be considered within the context of justice rather than compassion). 3.) If Christ has made plenary satisfaction for us, God has not the right to demand either faith or obedience from us.²⁵

Probably the most distinctive aspect of Arminian atonement is its opposition to the limited conception as advocated by Calvin and other Reformers, and the acceptance of an unlimited atonement. There was a vehement denial of the view that God can deprive the disobedient of atoning efficacy. The reasoning behind such an assertion was once again founded upon the Arminian attitude toward justice. It is considered an injustice to exact a double punishment from both Christ and man for the same sin. Arminians softened vicarious and expiatory atonement and "represent its direct effect to be to enable God, consistently with his justice and veracity, to enter into a new covenant with men, under which pardon is conveyed to all men on condition of repentance and faith."²⁶

The Methodist emphasis was more dynamic than its predecessor. Its insight into, and understanding of, Scriptural data, was considerably more profound and true. There is a startling difference between the two formulations and yet the contrast is not complete. Methodism clearly emphasized the substitutionary element in the atonement. It did not concur with the idea of a divine condition. Rather, we find a denial of Christ's death as a mere benefit, and included is the affirmation that Christ died in our stead. Christ offered himself in our stead and by his blood, which is the true symbol of the washing of sin, we receive our eternal redemption. "To die for us means to die in the place and stead of man, as a sacrificial oblation, by which satisfaction is made for the sins of the individual, so that they become remissible upon the terms of the evangelical covenant."²⁷ Although this emphasis is different in many ways, traces of Arminian thought are still in evidence. A similarity is noticed in the repetition of the term "satisfaction" for a penalty. The two are at complete variance regarding the justice of God. Methodism contended that the vicarious and propitiatory death of Christ was a sacrificial oblation to the justice of God, because of which pardon was offered to men through faith in the Gospel of Christ. Arminianism rejected this sacrifice to the justice of God, as has already been indicated.

The one common point rests in the extent of the effect of atonement. Even though the terminology is somewhat different, the results are some-

²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 374.

²⁶Philip Schaff, *History of the Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Bible House, 1876), Vol. 1, p. 518.

²⁷Richard Watson, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 285.

what identical. The Wesleyan adherents also advocated an unlimited atonement. "Christ did not only die for those that are saved, but for all those who do, or may perish."²⁸ In this pertinent specification the two groups stand united against most Calvinistic proclamations. This particular element will be further clarified in the succeeding discussion of grace, to which it is closely connected.

III

The following section includes some of the aspects in the doctrine of salvation. Because it is so difficult to isolate the items completely, the procedure will be to consider this inclusive heading and take up the subjects of grace, faith, and justification, illustrating their relatedness in the whole picture of salvation.

In Arminianism there was a commingling of grace and free will, a condition which has been greatly affected by its attitude toward sin. A concise definition of grace in Arminian theology is hard to come by. The structural form of Arminianism exposed a three-fold definition of grace in which the interrelationship of the other particulars in the doctrine of salvation was also evidenced. Grace was a "gratuitous affection" by which God was kindly disposed toward the sinner and by which he offered his Son as a condition for salvation. Secondly, it was an infusion into the human understanding and will. Without these gifts of faith and hope, man could do no good. It was lastly the perpetual assistance of the Holy Spirit by which he excited and stimulated a man to do that which was good.²⁹ It should be mentioned that this excitation to do good was provided only by the Holy Spirit. The conferment of grace included the commencement of good, the continuation of good, and the consummation of all good. There was an utter dependence upon grace in Arminian thought.

The value of the necessity of grace was partially nullified by the fact that God *must* bestow upon the individual sufficient grace to enable him to have faith.³⁰ This obligation was inseparably linked with justice. God cannot demand something (in this instance faith) which man has no capability of exerting. "God cannot by any right demand from fallen man faith in Christ which he cannot have of himself except God has either bestowed, or is ready to bestow, sufficient grace by which he may believe if he will."³¹ Grace was God's obligation to men. Because sin was not guilt, it was no more than equitable, that God should furnish man with sufficient power to resist his inherited evil tendency. Simply, God cannot demand faith except that he grant grace.

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 286.

²⁹James Arminius, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 253.

³⁰James Arminius, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 498.

³¹James Arminius, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 383.

Arminianism is usually recognized by the trademark "resistible grace." This is deduced from the emphasis placed upon man's part in the process of salvation. It is hardly necessary to dispute this characterization, for Arminius was consistently clear in his references to free will. Man can either accept or reject the assistance of the Holy Spirit. Ultimately it reverted to the proposition that man can either be saved, or by his own wickedness, which is immanent in his rejection, refuse to accept that without which he cannot be saved. The Arminian view of grace was synergistic. All men who hear the Word take to themselves a grace sufficient for salvation. If there was no apparent regeneration, it must stem from an exclusion of co-operative willingness on the part of man.

All unregenerated persons have freedom of will, and a capability of resisting the Holy Spirit, of rejecting the proffered grace of God, of despising the counsel of God against themselves, of refusing to accept the gospel of grace, and, of not opening to Him who knocks at the door of the heart, and these things they can actually do, without any difference of the elect and the reprobate.³²

This did not necessarily take the work of salvation out of God's hands, but it did relegate a great proportion to the capacity of humanity. God originally granted a "previous" grace, out of justice and offered to all, without which man was lost. The donation allowed man to do certain things that caused God to extend to him a special grace. "To him who does what he can by the primary grace already conferred upon him . . . God will bestow further grace upon him who profitably uses that which is primary."³³ This eventually grew into *prevenient*, proffered, and then *sanctifying* grace, as they were given by God, and in this order. In all fairness to Arminianism, it should be stated that man, in his natural condition and before the donation of *prevenient* grace, did not have the capacity to co-operate with the Holy Spirit. "Grace is not the solitary, yet it is the primary cause; for unless the free will had been excited by *prevenient* grace, it would not be able to co-operate with grace."³⁴ Still, this excluded as much as it allowed. It made the effect of grace one of stimulation or excitation and not necessarily one of change or renovation.

One of the most pronounced differences between Arminianism and Methodism is illustrated in the reason for which grace was offered. The Arminian source was the justice of God (see note 30). The Methodist looked to the love of God. He was not obligated to impart grace to man, because man has freely chosen evil. "The origin of human redemption is always traced to the love of God, which, resting upon undeserving man,

³²James Arminius, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 497.

³³James Arminius, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 329.

³⁴A quotation of Limborch by W. G. T. Shedd, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 188.

became grace."³⁵ Both divisions concur on the necessity for grace, but it possibly has a more virtuous foundation in Methodism.

Concerning resistible grace: the terminology in these two areas was very similar, but Methodism seemed to magnify the power of the Spirit while minimizing the choice of the individual. In this limited sphere it approached Calvinism, but cannot be identified with it, for in the final analysis it considered refusal and rejection of God's grace possible. Watson contended for an irresistible impulse, but not a permanent one.³⁶ The Apostle Paul, for example, was subsequently left to improve upon this impulse or not to. There was a powerful and yet resistible force operating within him to keep him faithful.³⁷ This position partially qualified Arminian freedom of rejection, but must ultimately be classified as a member of the same household, even though it does exist on a different level.

The final consideration under grace illustrates a similarity between the two systems. The work of God was prerequisite for man to be able to work out his salvation, indicating that the differences were nominal and that the results of grace justify the assertion that the two systems were quite similar. Even though Methodists employed the phrase "dead in sins," it did not allow man an excuse, because there was no man entirely void of the Holy Spirit and therefore no man completely destitute.³⁸ Man was once destitute, but he was no longer in this state because grace had remedied that situation. These are the essentials constituting the respective doctrines of grace and free will.

Many of the positions of Arminius are guarded and hesitant. This is true in his dissertation on justification, and he was especially hesitant in his presentation of the imputation of Christ's righteousness. William B. Pope, a Methodist, charged Arminius with Neonomianism: "Because of its supposed introduction of a new law, the law of grace, according to which the legal righteousness forever impossible to man is substituted by an Evangelical righteousness accepted of God, though imperfect, for Christ's sake."³⁹ This implied that Christ has lowered the demands of the law. To add to the confusion, Arminius willingly aligned himself with John Calvin. "I am prepared to give them [the Calvinists] my full approval."⁴⁰ The many conflicting affirmations make it exceedingly difficult to arrive at a conclusive decision. Arminius defined justification in this manner:

Justification is a just and gracious act of God as a judge, by which, from

³⁵William B. Pope, *A Compendium of Christian Theology* (New York: Hunt and Eaton, 1889), Vol. II, p. 361.

³⁶Richard Watson, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 448.

³⁷*Loc. cit.*

³⁸R. W. Burtner and R. E. Chiles, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

³⁹William B. Pope, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 444.

⁴⁰James Arminius, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 264.

the throne of his grace and mercy, he absolves from his sins, man, a sinner, but who is a believer on account of Christ, and the obedience and righteousness of Christ, and considers him righteous, to the salvation of the justified person, and to the glory of divine righteousness and grace.⁴¹

Of the two essential elements in justification, forgiveness of sins and the imputation of righteousness, Arminius fully endorsed forgiveness but only pays lip service to the latter. A completely objective imputation of Christ's righteousness was rejected, yet some degree of it was maintained.

Arminius was convinced that Christ and his obedience remained the object of our faith, but he also contended that they were not the object of justification or divine imputation. God did not impute Christ and his righteousness to us for righteousness.⁴² Arminius accepted faith and only faith in the act of imputation. "God imputes faith to us for righteousness, that is, he remits our sins to us who are believers, on account of Christ apprehended by faith, and accounts us righteous in him,"⁴³ but only in so far as faith is present. This imputation did not signify that faith was righteousness, but that faith was graciously accepted and accounted by God for righteousness.

The righteousness by which we are justified before God may in an accommodated sense be called imputative, as being righteousness either in the gracious estimation of God, since it does not according to the rigor or right of the law merit that appellation, or as being the righteousness of another, that is, of Christ, it is made ours by the gracious imputation of God.⁴⁴

Arminianism does not fully merit the characterization offered by Pope (see note 39), even though there is a seed of truth present, for there are several creditable references concerning the matter.

I believe that sinners are accounted righteous by the obedience of Christ, and that the righteousness of Christ is only the meritorious cause on account of which God pardons the sins of believers and reckons them as righteous as if they had perfectly fulfilled the law. But since God imputes the righteousness of Christ to none except believers, I conclude that in this sense, it may be well and properly said, to a man who believes, faith is imputed for righteousness through grace, because God has sent forth his Son, Jesus Christ, to be a propitiation, a throne of grace or mercy seat, through faith in his blood.⁴⁵

The condition of salvation was faith. It was requisite in those who wished to be partakers of salvation. Arminius also allowed certain election by which God administered the means to faith, though not faith itself. Faith was definitely not accepted as an effect of election nor as an effect of salvation, but the elusive deviation was found in the fact that faith was accepted for righteousness. Indecision also pervaded his thinking on the

⁴¹James Arminius, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 116.

⁴²James Arminius, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 356.

⁴³James Arminius, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 118.

⁴⁴James Arminius, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 356.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, p. 264.

question of the imputation of the active and passive obedience of Christ.⁴⁶ A crucial difference rested in the imputation of faith as a state of mind and this difference opened the way for later diversions.

The Methodists accepted the pardon from sin element in justification and differed only nominally in imputation. Faith was the requirement of God and not merely the instrument of justification. "Faith, for Wesley, is really nothing more than grace made conscious in the individual, or grace transformed from its latent stage into one of power and effectiveness."⁴⁷ Grace was the source and faith was the necessary and only condition of salvation. There was agreement between Wesley and Watson on the matter of imputation of Christ's righteousness.

But when is this righteousness imputed? When they believe. In that very hour the righteousness of Christ is theirs. But in what sense is this righteousness imputed to believers? In this; all believers are forgiven and accepted, not for the sake of anything in them, but wholly for the sake of what Christ hath done and suffered for them.⁴⁸

H. Lindstrom interprets this as a true reference and proof that Wesley did speak about an objective imputation,⁴⁹ but it is evident that this does not imply more than that by virtue of Christ's righteousness man shall obtain forgiveness and acceptance. The difference lay in the Arminian notion of faith acting as a substitute for righteousness and the Wesleyan contention that faith was the condition of imputation. The Methodist idea was also tempered by the fact that it often meant nothing more than forgiveness when referring to imputation.

IV

Undoubtedly the most controversial problem within the earlier movement was predestination. In order of weight of argument and importance, at least among early Arminians, predestination should possibly have been discussed at the outset of this study. In a sense it precipitated the original dispute. The decision to place it here arose from the term "conditional election," election conditioned by elements indicated in the previous sections.

Arminius first directed his opposition to supralapsarianism, but the dispute eventually grew into a wider rejection.⁵⁰ He began with a refutation of the twentieth question of the Heidelberg Catechism, rejecting absolute predestination to salvation. According to Arminius predestination was: 1.) Repugnant to the nature of God and his attributes. This

⁴⁶James Buchanan, *The Doctrine of Justification* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955), p. 171.

⁴⁷William R. Cannon, *The Theology of John Wesley* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946), p. 103.

⁴⁸Quoted from Wesley by Richard Watson, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 224.

⁴⁹Harald Lindstrom, *Wesley and Sanctification* (London: Epworth Press, 1946), p. 74.

⁵⁰James Arminius, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 241 ff.

was so because predestination meant God willed to save some with little or no regard to righteousness or obedience, or that he loved justice more than men. Note how justice continued to play an important part in Arminian thought. 2.) It was as contrary to human nature as it was to the nature of God. 3.) It was inconsistent with the nature and properties of sin. Sin was the meritorious cause of damnation. Sin, therefore, since it was a cause, cannot be placed among the means by which God executed his will. 4.) Predestination was repugnant to grace, because it was contrary to free will. 5.) Predestination was injurious to the glory of God. It made God the author of sin, and by the act he made man to sin. His thinking led him to proclaim that if this were the case, then God actually sinned, that God was the only sinner and that man merely followed, consequently reducing sin to something which was not really sin at all. 6.) He also considered predestination dishonorable to Christ, because it excluded Christ from the decree of salvation.⁵¹

Arminius followed this criticism with several positive citations.

- 1.) The first absolute decree of God concerning the salvation of sinful man, is that by which he decreed to appoint his Son, Jesus Christ . . . who might destroy sin, etc.
- 2.) The second precise and absolute decree of God, is that by which he decreed to receive into favor those who repent and believe, . . . but to leave in sin, and under wrath, all impenitent persons and unbelievers, and to damn them as aliens from Christ.
- 3.) The third divine decree is that by which God decreed to administer in a sufficient and efficacious manner the means which were necessary for repentance and faith.
- 4.) To these succeeds the fourth decree, by which God decreed to save and damn particular individuals. This decree has its foundation in the foreknowledge of God, by which he knew from all eternity those individuals who would, through his preventing grace, believe, and, through his subsequent grace would persevere, according to the before described administration of those means which are suitable and proper for conversion and faith; and by which knowledge, he likewise knew those who would not believe and persevere.⁵²

The most important element was that the divine decrees were conditioned by faith and obedience as foreseen by God. Election was not a decree to institute faith, but rather, to reward it.

Wesley's doctrine paralleled the Arminian, but with one minor distinction, the addition of which actually affected the sum total negligibly. Wesley outlined his thought in much the same fashion as did Arminius. Absolute predestination was rejected because it supposedly made God the

⁵¹James Arminius, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 221 ff. This is an abbreviated reproduction of only a part of the discussion. It is inserted primarily to show methodology.

⁵²*Ibid.*, pp. 247-8. This quotation was inserted because it is not only typical, but because it illustrates the integral relationship between Arminian election and his other formulations.

author of sin (see note 51). It was injurious to God because it made him revel in the damnation of man and this was contrary to Scripture. Predestination was completely opposed to the fact of Christ as Mediator, thus making much of his redeeming activity valueless. It was contrary to the efficacy of the Word. If predestination were rigid, preaching of the Gospel degenerated into an illusion and it was foolish to proclaim repentance or preach faith.⁵³

This doctrine makes the coming of Christ and his sacrifice on the cross, which Scripture affirms to have been the fruit of God's love to the world, to have been rather a testimony of God's wrath to the world, yea, one of the greatest judgments and severest acts that can be conceived of God's indignation toward mankind.⁵⁴

There is close affinity between Arminius and Wesley here.

The one peculiar phase of Wesley's election was that there was a kind of absolute element evident. By divine appointment some men were elected to a specific work in the world. This election was personal, absolute, and unconditional. To exemplify the position, Wesley referred to Cyrus, who was elected to rebuild the temple, and to Paul who was unconditionally elected to be a missionary and to preach the Gospel.⁵⁵ This type of election was not connected with eternal happiness, because one elected in this sense was still liable to be eternally lost.⁵⁶ This is not a contradiction of the Arminian position, but rather, an additional novelty inserted in an attempt to do justice to numerous Scriptural references. Wesley's doctrine did agree with the conditional election principle.

I believe election means a divine appointment of some men to eternal happiness. But I believe this election to be conditional, as well as the reprobation opposite thereto. I believe the eternal decree concerning both is expressed in those words; 'He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned'. And this decree without doubt God will not change, and a man cannot resist. According to this, all true believers are in Scripture termed elect, as all who continue in unbelief, are so long properly reprobates, that is, unapproved of God, and without discernment, touching the things of the Spirit.⁵⁷

It can be concluded that Arminianism and Methodism are quite similar at this point, for they both embrace conditional election based upon faith alone.

V

The doctrine of perseverance was never fully exploited or dwelt upon by Arminius, and he never came to the point of either accepting or

⁵³John Wesley, "Predestination Calmly Considered," *Interesting Tracts Explaining Several Important Points of Scripture Doctrine* (New York: Carlton and Phillips, 1854), p. 101. Notice the similarity to Arminianism.

⁵⁴*Loc. cit.*

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁵⁶*Loc. cit.*

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, p. 15.

rejecting it. He remained in indecision concerning the matter, seeing convincing arguments on both sides.⁵⁸ The followers of Arminius did come to a definite stand. The evidence was in the fifth article of the "Remonstrance," which was composed by Uytenbogaert with the advice of Episcopius, Grotius, and others. The thorough rejection of perseverance was a natural consequence of the Arminian doctrine of resistible grace. If man can once reject the power of the Spirit, he can also lose it. The Remonstrants did not share Arminius' indecision, but clearly taught the possibility of a total and final fall from grace. P. Schaff contends that they denied, with the Roman Catholics, the possibility of assurance except by special revelation,⁵⁹ and this revelation was both extra-ordinary and extremely rare.

This attitude eventually evolved into the Methodist position. Most of the Wesleyans taught the possibility of falling from grace. The Methodist approach is illuminated by this question and answer:

Can they [men] fall from it [the condition of Christian perfection]? I am well assured they can. Matter of fact puts this beyond dispute. Formerly we thought, one saved from sin, could not fall. Now we know the contrary. We are surrounded with instances of those, who lately experienced all that I mean by perfection. They had both the fruit of the Spirit and the witness; by virtue of anything that is implied in the nature of the state. There is no such height or strength of holiness, as it is impossible to fall from. If there be any that cannot fall, this wholly depends on the promise and faithfulness of God.⁶⁰

The discussion of perseverance brings this comparison to a close. Some of the conclusions have involved rather radical differences, as in the doctrine of sin; others have been in close harmony, such as that of predestination. Even though differences are evident, these two movements would readily join together in emphasizing these words: "We love him, because he first loved us — This is the sum of all religion, the genuine model of Christianity. None can say more. Why should anyone say less? or less intelligibly?"⁶²

⁵⁸James Arminius, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 254.

⁵⁹Philip Schaff, *op. cit.*, p. 519.

⁶⁰Jno. L. Tigert, *The Doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America* (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1902), Vol. II, p. 112. The article is entitled "Christian Perfection" by John Wesley. The doctrine of perfection is not developed by Arminius; therefore, it has only been mentioned in connection with perseverance.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁶²R. W. Burtner and R. E. Chiles, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

THE INFLUENCE OF JEREMIAH UPON NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE

HENRY J. BOEKHOVEN

For this paper I am indebted to Westcott and Hort's *The New Testament in the Original Greek* in which book the authors print a list of Old Testament texts quoted in the New. In this list we find a goodly number of quotations from the Book of Jeremiah used in the New Testament. There are also some cross references to subsequent Old Testament writers, particularly Ezekiel. Although I may mention a few cases of influence of Jeremiah upon Ezekiel, yet I will limit this paper to his influence upon the New Testament, because in the case of a complete study of his influence upon subsequent Old Testament literature we would have an extensive study about the dating of the material in question.¹

Furthermore, another limitation is necessary, namely with respect to the direct and the indirect influence. Under direct influence I understand the cases where Jeremiah's words or texts are quoted literally or cases where subsequent authors very clearly depend upon Jeremiah's figures of speech. Indirect influence is a matter of domination of Jeremiah's spirit where his words are not being used. I prefer to limit myself to his direct influence. It will be readily understood that a study of the indirect influence would carry us too far. I am thinking of Jeremiah's stress on individualism. Jeremiah is often held to be the prophet who developed the concept of individualism and subsequent Bible writers have accepted this concept from him. However, Wright claims that "Individual and corporate responsibility . . . went hand in hand . . . In the earliest law of the covenant the individual is addressed together with the group, and life

¹We would have to study the dating of a number of Psalms and further study whether there is a direct (or indirect) influence of Jeremiah in those Psalms, namely xxii, xxxi, xxxv, xxxviii, xl, lv, lxix, lxxi, lxxxviii. See A. F. Kirkpatrick, *Psalms Book I and Psalms Book II and III*, (Cambridge), under Psalms referred to. In a manuscript of the LXX Von Orelli found remarks about Psalms lxxv and cxxxvii which indicate that these were written by Jeremiah, cf., the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*, VI, p. 120. And John Owen suggests that Psalms xlvii and cxxxvii were written by Jeremiah, cf., his preface to Calvin's *Commentary on Jeremiah*.

We would also have to deal with so-called II Isaiah.

And Ezekiel would interest us: he is Jeremiah's younger contemporary. But who has written what first? E.g., Jer. xxxi, 29 is generally regarded the original and Ez. xviii, 2 based upon this text. Elliott Binns lists 18 cases where he compares these two prophets, cf., *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah*, p. lxxxiv. (Jer. vi, 14 and vi, 22 should be changed around in this list).

achieved its true meaning in the context of God's promise and demand, and of man's faith and obedience."² I regard this and other subject matters outside the scope of this paper.³

As far as the direct influence of Jeremiah is concerned we have many expressions which are not necessarily originally Jeremianic although they appear in the Book of Jeremiah. An expression that is not typically Jeremianic is e.g., "pain . . . as of a woman in travail" — this expression was in common use.⁴ There are peculiar expressions which remind us of Jeremiah only very remotely. Ezekiel in xx, 28 may refer to Jeremiah ii, 7, but the reader will readily agree that every Bible writer can speak this way: Ezekiel "I had brought them into the land" and Jeremiah "I brought you into a plentiful land." That is the same with the figure of the "Branch," used in Jer. xxiii, 5 and Zech. iii, 8 and vi, 12. But the connection in which the word "millstone" is used could well go back to Jeremiah: compare Jer. xxv, 10 and Rev. xviii, 22 "the sound of the millstone."

JEREMIAH AND JESUS

Jeremiah's direct influence upon the New Testament is noticeable in the Gospels. Jesus borrowed from Jeremiah. Heaton compared the lives of Jeremiah and Jesus to a certain extent and he comes up with the following statement: Jeremiah's "life and work provide one of the best explanations of the claim of Jesus that he had come to 'fill out' the revelation which God gave to his ancient people."⁵ It is clear from several instances that Jesus had read Jeremiah's prophecies. On one occasion he asks his disciples: "Having eyes, do you not see, and having ears, do you not hear?" St. Mark viii, 18. It reminds us of Jer. v, 21: "Hear this, O foolish and senseless people, who have eyes but see not, who have ears but hear not."⁶ On another occasion we hear Jeremiah in the words of Jesus, Matt. xi, 29: "Take my yoke upon you . . . and you will find rest for your souls," which reminds us of Jer. vi, 16: "Thus says the Lord: Stand by the roads, and look, and ask for the ancient paths, where the good way is; and walk in it, and find rest for your souls." Jeremiah tells us of what the Lord God thinks of his house at a certain time, vii, 11: "Has this house, which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes? Behold, I myself have seen it, says the Lord." And Jesus overturns the tables of the moneychangers and says: "You have made it [my house] a den of robbers," Matt. xxi, 13; Mark xi, 17; Luke xiv, 46. We know of Jere-

²G. Ernest Wright, *The Old Testament Against Its Environment*, p. 69.

³E. g., Jeremiah's attitude towards the sabbath and towards sacrifice, and his conception of the New Covenant.

⁴Cf., Enoch lxii, 4; I Thess. v, 3; Ps. xlviii, 6; Jer. xiii, 21; Micah iv, 9; see E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, pp. 76f.

⁵E. W. Heaton, *The Old Testament Prophets* (Pelican Book), p. 28.

⁶We find the same words in Ez. xii, 2.

miah's complaint in xii and in his answer to this complaint we hear God say: "I have forsaken my house" (vs. 7). In Matthew xxiii Jesus pronounces woes and in the woe over Jerusalem he says: "Behold, your house is forsaken and desolate" (vs. 38). Some MSS delete "and desolate." And in Luke xiii, 35: "Behold, your house is forsaken." Jeremiah speaks of the house of Judah becoming a desolation, cf., xxii, 5.

The use Jesus made of Jer. v, 21 makes me believe that we have to do with more than an external agreement between Jeremiah and Jesus. I feel that Jesus' quoting Jeremiah generally indicates an agreement with the contents of statements in question.

STEPHEN'S STYLE SHOWS INDEBTEDNESS TO JEREMIAH

The message Stephen spoke immediately preceding his death contains a few instances of Jeremic style. Acts vii, 51: "You stiff-necked people, uncircumcised in heart and ears, you always resist the Holy Spirit. As your fathers did, so do you." This reminds us of Jer. ix, 26: "... and all the house of Israel is uncircumcised in heart." In the RSV translation another reference to Jeremiah's "uncircumcised" is lost, namely in vi, 10: "Behold their ears are closed, they cannot listen." This "closed" is the same as Stephen's word "uncircumcised."⁷ In the same speech Stephen refers to the "host of heaven" and the worship thereof (vs. 42). Jeremiah speaks of people burning incense on housetops to all the host of heaven in xix, 13.

"The Deuteronomist and Jeremiah exhibit a sharp reaction against the paganizing of Yahwism made possible by the inclusion of the heavenly bodies in the assembly. Manasseh erected altars to them in the very courts of the temple (2 Kings 21.3-5). Jeremiah speaks of people burning incense on housetops to all the host of heaven and pouring out drink offerings to other gods (Chap. 19.13). Nevertheless the stars continued as members of the assembly in the Post-Exilic period, though it was not permitted to give them independent worship."⁸

JEREMIAH AND PAUL

Paul also shows indebtedness to Jeremiah, as a matter of fact, more than anyone else in the New Testament. I will refer to ten different instances. It seems to me that Paul is doing more than only referring to Jeremiah; it is also more than agreement with Jeremiah, for it appears that Paul saw his example in Jeremiah. I note the way Paul indicates his call to preach: Gal. i, 15, 16: "Before I was born . . . that I might preach among the gentiles. . . ." We hear this also in Jeremiah's prophecies, i, 5: "Before you were born . . . I [the Lord] appointed you a prophet to the nations." Jesus addresses Paul at his conversion as follows, Acts xxvi,

⁷"Uncircumcised" in connection with speaking: not initiated into speaking, unskilled to speak; in connection with ears: unskilled to listen; in connection with trees: fruit not yet allowed to be eaten. Cf., Koehler-Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, p. 737.

⁸G. E. Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

16-18: "... I have appeared to you ... delivering you from the people and from the Gentiles—to whom I send you to open their eyes. . . ." This we compare with Jer. i, 7 where the Lord says: "Do not say 'I am only a youth'; for to all to whom I send you you shall go and whatever I command you you shall speak. Be not afraid of them for I am with you to deliver you." In a Psalm of Thanksgiving in I Chronicles xvi, 35 we find these words: "Deliver us, O God of our salvation, and gather and save us from among the nations." It is not impossible that Jeremiah in turn was dependent upon this Psalm.

After Paul's call we find him in Corinth amongst people who are against his preaching activities. Here the Lord says to him, Acts xviii, 9f: "Do not be afraid . . . for I am with you. . . ." The Lord says to Jeremiah i, 8: "Be not afraid of them, for I am with you to deliver you." When Paul formulated the inspired Word he may well have been thinking of Isaiah also, xliii, 5, where the Lord said to Israel: "Fear not, for I am with you."

Paul surely refers to Jeremiah when he uses the figure of speech in Romans ii, 29: "Real circumcision is a matter of the heart." See Jer. iv, 4: "Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, remove the foreskin of your hearts. . . ." Stephen used the same figure of speech, only in the negative form.

Paul writes in I Cor. i, 31 and in II Cor. x, 17: "Let him who boasts, boast of the Lord." In the first case, however, he adds a formula "as it is written." Ellis draws attention to this.⁹ Reading Paul we get the impression that he quotes from Jeremiah, which is not the case, however. The Pauline texts are "at variance with the LXX and the Hebrew where they agree."¹⁰ Jer. ix, 24 reads as follows: "But let him who glories glory in this that he understands and knows me, that I am the Lord, who practice kindness, justice, and righteousness in the earth; for in these things I delight, says the Lord." Paul did not quote, although he says "as it is written," but a direct influence of Jeremiah is evident here.

The matter of God's wrath comes up in Jer. x, 25 where he says to God: "Pour out thy wrath upon the nations that know thee not, and upon the peoples that call not upon thy name. . . ." Paul reminds us of this statement twice; first in I Thess. iv, 5 where he tells us of God's will with respect to the taking of a wife, that should not be done "in the passion of lust like heathen who do not know God," and then in II Thess. i, 8 where Paul boasts in the churches of Jesus Christ, but at the same time he speaks of the Lord "inflicting vengeance upon those who do not know God and upon those who do not obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus." Paul makes

⁹E. E. Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 11, note 3.

¹⁰*Idem*, pp. 150ff. Paul and LXX have the same word for "to boast" and "to glory."

excellent use in Romans xi, 17-24 of what Jeremiah "suggested" to him in xi, 16: "The Lord once called you, 'A green olive tree, fair with goodly fruit'; but with roar of a great tempest he will set fire to it, and its branches will be consumed."¹¹

The figure of "clay in the potter's hand" is not a particularly Jeremiatic turn of speech. The metaphorical language was used by Isaiah already, xxix, 16 and xlv, 9. Jeremiah uses it in xviii, 6; The Book of Wisdom in xv, 7; and Paul in Romans ix, 21. Yet it is important to notice that Jeremiah and Paul used this figure of speech, even though a few more authors worked with it. It is a beautiful expression which tells us that "God can do what he wills, just as the potter can make ornamental vessels and chamber-pots. 'As little as the clay guides the hand of the potter at his work, so little does a man compel God to give' (Schlatter)."¹²

There is a verbal connection between Jeremiah xi, 20 where he says: "But, O Lord of hosts, . . . who triest the heart and mind . . . to thee have I committed my cause" and Paul in I Thess. ii, 4: "we speak not to please man, but to please God, who tests our hearts."

And finally a few words about the use of the concept of wrath. Jeremiah writes in i, 25: "The Lord has opened his armory, and brought out the weapons of his wrath . . ." and Paul writes in Romans ix, 22: "What if God, desiring to show his wrath and to make known his power, has endured with much patience the vessels of wrath made for destruction." I think we lose the sense of Paul's "made for destruction," if we do not listen to the Greek very closely. The Greek reads "made ready for destruction." The RSV gives an unfortunate translation here. "'Ready for destruction' does not, however, mean 'made for destruction,' and being a vessel of wrath does not imply having been made in or for wrath."¹³ It seems to me that both Jeremiah and Paul indicate the ultimate possibility of destruction in God's wrath, but there is still the appointed time of grace. There are a great number of things in both Paul and Jeremiah that make for close relationship. Paul must have loved to read Jeremiah again and again! There is more than an external relationship here; these are "congenial spirits."

JEREMIAH AND JAMES

Westcott and Hort bring Acts xv, 15 f., where James, the brother of the Lord, speaks, in connection with Jer. xii, 15. This particular section reminds me more of Amos ix, 11.¹⁴ In his letter James reminds us of Jer. v, 24 where we find the words "the autumn rain and the spring rain." James v, 7 reminds us of these words more or less, when we read of the

¹¹Rev. xx, 9 reminds us of Jeremiah also, though remotely.

¹²Emil Brunner, "The Letter to the Romans," pp. 86f.

¹³*Idem*, p. 87.

¹⁴Cf., Dr. F. W. Grosheide, *Handelingen der Apostelen* II, p. 39.

farmer waiting for "the early and the late rain." I wonder, however, whether we can actually speak of direct Jeremianic influence here. Deuteronomy xi, 14, already tells of the Lord willing to give "the early rain and the later rain," unless we regard this written later than Jeremiah, a conclusion of which I am not convinced. Compare also Joel ii, 23 and Zech. x, 1.

The only one case which I know of where we find Jeremianic influence seems to be James v, 5 where we find the same figure of speech as in Jer. xii, 3 viz., the "day of slaughter." It seems to me that we cannot speak of actual influence of Jeremiah upon James.

JEREMIAH AND THE BOOK OF REVELATION

Here we have a better example of influence. I am under the firm impression that the writer of the Book of Revelation knew Jeremiah's Book very well and mastered its style. "It is alleged by Credner, that the use made of the Old Testament betrays an acquaintance on the part of the writer with the Hebrew text."¹⁵

In Jer. i, 10 we read that the Lord said to Jeremiah: "I have set you this day over nations and over kingdoms." And in Rev. x, 11 we read that John was told: "You must again prophesy about many peoples and nations and tongues and kings." See also Jer. xxv, 30. The language used in Jer. i, 10 and Rev. x, 11 is found in Daniel also, cf., Dan. iii, 4 and vii, 14. It is not impossible that Daniel is dependent upon Jeremiah.

The figure of "fountain of living water" is found in Jer. ii, 13; and in Rev. vii, 17 we read that the Lamb will guide them "to springs of living water." The words referring to "water," "living water," etc., were always very important in a dry Eastern land.

Jer. iv, 29 appears in a section about judgment: "At the noise of horseman . . . they enter thickets; they climb among rocks . . ." It must be compared with Rev. vi, 15 where we read in a section dealing with the sixth seal: ". . . and every one . . . hid in the caves and among the rocks of the mountains. . . ." It is interesting to hear Isaiah in regard to Judah and Jerusalem in ii, 10: "Enter into the rock, and hide in the dust from before the terror of the Lord. . . ."

Jer. v, 14, where the Lord says, "Because they have spoken this word, behold, I am making my words in your mouth a fire and this people wood, and the fire shall devour them," must be compared with Rev. xi, 15, "And if any one would harm them [the two witnesses], fire pours from their mouth and consumes their foes. . . ." The background for these words can be found in David's Song of Deliverance where he writes with respect to God: "Smoke went up from his nostrils and devouring fire from his mouth," II Sam. xxii, 9.

¹⁵Albert Barnes, *Notes on the New Testament—Revelation*, p. xli.

We can compare Jer. x, 7, "Who would not fear thee, O King of the nations?" with Rev. xv, 4, "Who shall not fear and glorify thy name, O Lord?" Similar words are found in Jer. x, 10 and Rev. xv, 3, Jer. x, 10: "But the Lord is the true God, he is the living God and the everlasting king. . . ." and Rev. xv, 3 (part): "Great and wonderful are thy deeds, O Lord God the Almighty! Just and true are thy ways, O King of the ages!"¹⁶ This section of the book of Revelation is the first part of the Song of Moses and the Song of the Lamb which the conquerors are singing while standing beside the sea of glass.

Jer. xvii, 10 is used by the author of the Book of Revelation even three times. The first section of this text is used once and the second section thrice. The text reads as follows: "I, the Lord, search the mind and try the heart, to give to every man according to his ways, according to the fruit of his doings." Both sections are used in Rev. ii, 23 in the letter to Thyatira: ". . . I am he who searches mind and heart, and I will give to each of you as your works deserve." The latter section of Jeremiah's text is used both in Rev. xx, 12: ". . . and the dead were judged . . . by what they had done," and in Rev. xxii, 12: "Behold, I am coming soon . . . to repay everyone for what he has done."

And finally I suggest to compare Rev. xvi, 19 with Jer. xxv, 15 where we find "the cup of the fury of his wrath" and the "cup of the wine of wrath."

¹⁶"O King of the ages," other MSS: "O King of the nations."

CAMPUS HIGHLIGHTS

Our new year began with convocation lectures given by Professor Joseph Haroutunian of Mc Cormick Seminary, Chicago. His lectures given on Wednesday, September 7, were entitled "The Gospel of Forgiveness" and "Grace in the Church" and were well received.

At the Thursday morning formal convocation, the Rev. Henry J. Ten Clay, president of the Board, presided and introduced our new president, The Rev. Harold N. Englund, who gave the address for the morning entitled "On Wearing Christ's Yoke."

The convocation luncheon held in our commons brought many alumni and friends together. The M. C. was the Rev. Chester Postma, vice-president of the Board who took care of the formalities and introduced Dr. John H. Piet who addressed the gathering on the subject, "Jesus Christ, the Light of the World." Dr. Piet is another addition to our faculty. He will give courses in the English Bible department.

A pleasant reception was held for our two new members of the faculty on Wednesday evening after the convocation lecture. Ministers, Hope College personnel and various friends of our city came to welcome our new professors to the fellowship of Holland. Refreshments were

served in the commons by the faculty wives.

Our readers will be interested to learn something about the background of the new members of the faculty. The Rev. Mr. Englund is a graduate of the University of California, and a graduate of our seminary in 1950. He served the Second Reformed Church of Zeeland until 1958, during which time he was given leave to take up graduate work in Edinburgh and London. While abroad, he traveled in Europe and the Middle East. During the past two years he served the Midland Reformed Church, Midland, Michigan. He and Mrs. Englund have two sons, Brian, 9 years, and Bruce, 2 years.

Dr. John H. Piet is a graduate of Hope College and of our seminary in 1939. After a year of preparatory study at Hartford Seminary, he and Mrs. Piet became missionaries serving the Church of South India. The past several years, Dr. Piet has been chairman of the Vellore Evangelistic Council. He has promoted with great success Bible Study Courses through correspondence. During his furlough 1946-47, he completed his graduate study for the Ph.D. degree which Columbia University conferred upon him. The title of his dissertation was *A Logical Presentation of the Saiva Siddhanta Philos-*

ophy. The Piets have two sons, John Judson, a student at Hope College and David, a high school student.

With the coming of our new professors we recognize that Dr. John R. Mulder retires from active duty, after being a member of our faculty thirty-two years. At our commencement service, last May, fitting recognition was given by the Board, alumni, students and faculty for Dr. Mulder's long and appreciated service. All the Seminary and the many friends express their best wishes to Dr. and Mrs. Mulder for the years ahead, and they pray that God's grace may continue to enrich their lives.

We welcome all the new students who have come to our campus. They are as follows: Henry R. Arnold, Burnips, Michigan; Sherwin Broersma, Vriesland, Michigan; Carl DeJong, Orange City, Iowa; Robert DeYoung, Center Point, Iowa; Evert Fikse, Holland, Michigan; Richard Forsythe, Stockbridge, Michigan; Paul Fries, Muskegon, Michigan; John Grooters, Clarkfield, Minnesota; Wayne Hall, Grand Rapids, Michigan; Richard Huizenga, Berwyn, Illinois; David Jackson, Derbe, New York; Roger Kleinheksel, Holland, Michigan; Harold Kruizenga, Maurice, Iowa; Jeremy Chong-Hian Law, Hong Kong; Elsie Wen-Hua Shih Law, Hong Kong; Stanley Hsiang King Lin, Hong Kong; Gary Looman, Zeeland, Michigan; Carroll Morris,

Dorr, Michigan; John Nordstrom, Dolton, Illinois; Jacobus Opmeer, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; John Padgett, Grandville, Michigan; George Peelen, Kalamazoo, Michigan; Harlan Ratmeyer, Forresteron, Illinois; Luther Ratmeyer, Forresteron, Illinois; Ervin Roorda, Pella, Iowa; Harold Rust, Freeport, Illinois; Arthur Scheid, Rochelle Park, New Jersey; Ronald Smith, Pasadena, California; Adrian Ten Hor, Prospect Park, New Jersey; Richard Ter Maat, Cedar Grove, Wisconsin; Rowland Van Es, Yakima, Washington; Stephen Van Houten, Berwick, Pennsylvania; Adrian Van Wyk, Pella, Iowa; Sipko Veldhuis, Alton, Iowa; Ralph Ver Ploeg, Pella, Iowa; Russell Yonkers, Muskegon, Michigan.

Students returning to the campus after serving their summer charges report significant experiences in their fields of service. The following is a list of fields served by the young men of the seminary. Vernon Hoffs, Denver, Colorado; Richard Stadt, Nardin Park, Detroit; Merle Brouwer, First, Mt. Greenwood, Illinois; Donald Lindskoog, Emmanuel, Chicago, Illinois; James DeWitt, Ivanhoe, and Gano, Chicago, Illinois; Norman Ratering, Fulton, Illinois; Roger Vander Kolk, Bethany, Chicago, Illinois; William Unzicker, First and Grace, Lansing, Illinois; Byron White, First, Lafayette, Indiana; Robert Bast, Calvary, South Holland, Illinois; Marvin Beukelman, Whalley and Alberne, British Columbia;

Robert deForest, San Jose and Calvary, Ripon, California; Truman Raak, First, Ravenna, Michigan; Gary Vande Kamp, Marshall, Michigan; Mel Van Hattem, East Coast, Florida; Daniel Van't Kerkhoff, West Coast, Florida; Stanley Vander Weide, Yankton, South Dakota; Paul Benes, Romence Road, Oakland Drive Area, Kalamazoo, Michigan; Larry Arends, Calvary, Southgate, Michigan; John Brouwer, Logan, Dell Rapids, South Dakota; Ervin Voogd, Hope, Spencer, Iowa; Robert Van Earden, Deleware, Lennox, South Dakota; Marvin Hoff, Hawthorne, New Jersey; Howard Davis, Bethel, Grand Rapids; Kenneth Vander Broek, Bethany, Grand Rapids; John Hammersma, Grace, Grand Rapids; Larry Izenbart, Calvary, Grand Rapids; George Magee, Macy, Nebraska; Roger Bruggink, Kentucky; John Bandt, Mescalero, New Mexico; William de Forest, Elmendorf, New York City; John Zwylghuizen, Winnebago, Nebraska; John Rozendaal, Migrant Work, Michigan; John Bylsma, Elmendorf, New York City; Ronald Geschwendt, Chippewa Resort, Holland, Michigan; Wilfred Fiet, Kankakee, Illinois; Frank Shearer, Orlando, Florida; William Van Malsen, First, Grand Haven, Michigan; Robert Vander Aarde, Community, Dolton Area, Chicago, Illinois; Vernon Van Bruggen, Dover, North Dakota; Jerome Julien, Fairview, Grand Rapids and Pittsburgh, Pennsyl-

vania; Raymond DeDoe, Central, Grand Rapids; Alvin Eissens, Eddyville, Iowa; David DeRuiter, Santa Ana, California; Lambert DeJong, Southern, California; Sam Vander Schaaf, Brockville, Canada; Gordon Damsteegt, Dog Pound, Canada; James Stevens, First, Pella, Iowa; Robert De Young, Hudsonville, Michigan; Russell Sybesma, North Park, Kalamazoo; Robert Vander Schaaf, Aplington, Iowa; Donald Lohman, First, DeMotte, Indiana.

Tom Harris is returning to our campus after a year of internship at Elmendorf, New York City.

Grover Davis who served our church at Raritan, Illinois, and Robert Wallinga who served the Washington Church at Ackley, Iowa, will return for part of the year to finish their work at the seminary.

The following are members of the 1960 graduating class, and their first fields of service: Allen Aardema, American Reformed Church, Primghar, Iowa; Owen Bechtel, Missionary to Formosa; Allen Boeve, Grace Reformed, Whalley, British Columbia; Louis Buytendorp, Alsip, Chicago, Illinois; Wilbur Daniels, Glen Lake, Michigan; Robert Eggebeen, Feura Bush, New York; Ki-Bum Han, graduate study, Louis Harvey, Falmouth, Michigan; John Helmus, Calgary, Alberta, Canada; Harold Hiemstra, Bethany, New York City; Leroy Koopman, Faith Community, Stickney, Chicago; George Kroeze, Trinity, Schenectady, New York; Harry

Mencarelli, Trinity, Chicago, Illinois; Harold Patz, graduate study; Arnold Punt, Silver Creek, German Valley, Illinois; Richard Rhem, Spring Lake, Michigan; Robert Shaver, Riverside, Paterson, New Jersey; Louis Smith, undecided; Brook Stephens, Waterloo, Iowa; Robert Strain, Forest Home, Muskegon, Michigan; Douglas Vander

Hey, Westfield, North Dakota; Nathan Vander Werf, Ebenezer, Morrison, Illinois; Vernon Vander Werff, Palos Heights, Illinois; Merwin Van Doornik, Sprakers and Currytown, New York; Hendrik Van Essen, Vancouver, British Columbia; Harvey Van Farowe, Clinton, Wisconsin; John Zwiers, Military Chaplaincy.

BOOK REVIEWS

A History of Israel, by John Bright, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959. Pp. 500. \$7.50.

The words of Paul to King Agrippa, "This was not done in a corner," may well be used to describe the history of Israel. This book of Professor Bright illustrates that Israel did not live in some back corner of the Arabian desert but on the highway of world affairs. The author's purpose is to set the history of the Old Testament in the context of relevant world history. This purpose he admirably achieves.

The author is Professor of Hebrew and the Interpretation of the Old Testament at Union Seminary, Richmond. His two previous books, *The Kingdom of God* (1953) and *Early Israel in Recent History Writing* (1956), have amply demonstrated his ability to write as a well-informed scholar. The former book gives us the author's interpretation of the message of the Old Testament and the latter his defense of the historicity of the Old Testament narrative. With these books as a background, the reader of *A History of Israel* is assured that Professor Bright has a genuine understanding of the teaching of the Bible, and that he is abreast of all the critical problems that engage the minds of scholars.

The first part of the book is "Prologue: The Ancient Orient before ca. 2000 B.C." The civilizations of the early, middle and new stone ages are briefly described. The point is made that long before the second millennium B.C., the time of the patriarchs, cultures of the Mesopotamian and Nile valleys had been developed. No one can declare how far back the evidences of human life take us, yet surely into the Early

Paleolithic Age, beyond the ninth millennium B.C. However, it is in the Neolithic Age that man changed from a cave dweller to sedentary life, and from a food-gatherer to a food-producer. Evidences of this age have been uncovered at Jericho, the seventh and sixth millenniums B.C. (pp. 18f.). So this makes Israel's coming into Canaan at the close of the second millennium a newcomer into an old world!

The span of history that is taken up is from the age of the patriarchs, the first half of the second millennium B.C. to the post-exilic time, the third and second centuries B.C. The method is to gather as much information as possible about the nations and cultures around Israel, and to examine all the biblical data on the history of Israel, and from these two sources construct the history of the chosen people of God. One merit of the book—and there are others—is that it has the latest and the best that recent studies in archaeology and ancient history have produced. The author has kept abreast in his studies and has made use of the interesting and instructive contributions that Old Testament scholarship is producing.

If one has read the author's *Early Israel in Recent History Writing*, it comes as no surprise that the author accepts the historicity of the narratives, as opposed to the Alt-Noth school, which is very sceptical of the history in the Old Testament accounts. That is to say, the Alt-Noth position may accord some reality to Jacob, less to Abraham and Isaac, but the stories about the patriarchs are later tales that collected about the eponymous ancestors. Bright holds that our knowledge of patriarchal times has been greatly enriched, both as to law and custom and as to migra-

Provocative
new
books



from the
Westminster
Press

**CHURCH EDUCATION
FOR TOMORROW**

By **WERNER FALLAW**. Every Protestant who is sincerely concerned over the problem of religious illiteracy will welcome Dr. Fallaw's fresh, drastic and prophetic recommendations for local churches and the training of their leaders. \$3.75

**EFFICIENT CHURCH
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT**

By **JOHN C. BRAMER, JR.** Based on his own successful banking and business management practices, Mr. Bramer has developed a set of procedures for the handling of church business and finance. His charts, diagrams and sample forms will be invaluable aids to administrators of churches large and small. \$3.50

**AGENTS OF
RECONCILIATION**

By **ARNOLD B. COME**. The first book to present, in terms the layman can readily grasp, the growing need for developing a heightened sense of responsibility, in both clergy and laity, for returning the Christian Church to its real purpose of serving instead of being served. \$3.95

**BIBLICAL AUTHORITY
FOR MODERN PREACHING**

By **CHARLES W. F. SMITH**. An analysis of what is wrong with worship and preaching today, and how the conflict between traditional preaching and the modern scientific attitude toward all knowledge can be resolved. \$3.50

THE BATTLE FOR THE SOUL

Aspects of Religious Conversion

By **OWEN BRANDON**. The psychological phenomenon of religious conversion, opportunities for bringing it about, and the problems created by it, are discussed by an experienced pastor, and teacher of theology and the psychology of religion. Paper, \$1.25

Now at your bookstore

THE WESTMINSTER PRESS
Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7

tion of tribes, and maintains that the historicity of the narrative has been greatly enhanced. That is not to say that the discoveries at Mari or at Nuzi "prove" the historicity of the patriarchs. Yet since some laws and customs of those times seem to be reflected in the Old Testament narrative, it seems more and more likely that we have people of flesh and bone in these stories, rather than stories to explain the origin of sacred sites.

Chapter 3, "Exodus and Conquest," may be used as a sample of the method used throughout the book. In this chapter the Egyptian and Canaanite backgrounds are thoroughly discussed and the material of the Bible is placed along side of them. This sets the date of the Exodus in the latter part of the thirteenth century, which seems right to me. The old date of the middle of the fifteenth century has been abandoned. The datum of I Kings 6:1, which says that the fourth year of Solomon was 480 years after the Exodus can be explained as meaning twelve generations. If one allows twenty-five years to a generation instead of forty, this would bring the time of the Exodus to the thirteenth century. Recent discussions of location of sites, such as Mt. Sinai, are taken into account. The problem of the large number of Israelites now appears to have solution through Mendenhall's research, which points out that the word for thousand, *'elef*, is a term for a small military unit (pp. 120f.).

It is unnecessary and surely impossible to discuss all the well-arranged divisions of Israel's history. This book helps one to appreciate the battles Israel had with foes within and without; it describes in an interesting manner the rise and fall of a nation in which the voice of God was always heard through his servants the prophets. The distinctive and unique quality of Israel's faith is made clear in that God's plan of redemption, never fully realized in the Old Testament, is never abandoned, especially not in the

time of Israel's great disgrace, the Exile (Chapter 9, "Exile and Restoration"). The author has done more than write a history; he has given us the meaning and message of this history. As a Christian scholar he rightly senses that the fulfilment of this history is in the coming of Jesus Christ (pp. 452f.).

Good books have incidental features which greatly enhance their value. I would like to mention some in this book: the many references to recent studies, which gives one the opportunity to follow through on important and interesting issues, the chronological charts which set Israel and Judah in parallel columns with their neighbors, the indexes that list the subjects and the texts of the Bible and the Apocrypha, and the Westminster Historical Maps with a map index.

Reviewers have already expressed their appreciation (J. Muilenburg in *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, May 1960, and J. A. Kelso in *Christianity Today*, May 9, 1960). I would like to add mine by stating that *A History of Israel* will be much used in college and seminaries classes studying the Old Testament.

LESTER J. KUYPER

The Letter to the Romans, by Emil Brunner, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1952. Pp. 9-168. \$3.50.

This theological-devotional commentary is an English translation of the same work by Brunner which was first published in Germany in 1938. The volume consists of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, Brunner's passage by passage exposition, and an appendix of thirty-seven pages which has a page or two expositions of fifteen topics: Resurrection, Spirit and Flesh, The Righteousness of God, The Law and the Works of the Law, Faith, Grace, Sanctification, and Jesus Christ. Also included are: The Church, The Communion

ity; Love; Predestination, Election; The Justification of the Sinner; Sin; Baptism; The Wrath of God and Reconciliation (p. 131).

Brunner is not as bold as Luther who said that Romans is "the principal part of the New Testament." However he does go along with Luther to the extent of saying that "the letter to the Romans is fateful in the history of the Christian Church." Time and time again, according to Brunner, the fate of the church of Christ has depended on its understanding and evaluation of Romans. He believes that Paul has supplied in this epistle "the material and pointed the way for the whole of Christian theology and all Christian thought. . ." (p. 11).

Such subjects as the relationship of the Jews and Gentiles to the law, the relationship of the Old Testament and the New Testament with regard to redemption, the righteousness of God in Christ Jesus, the significance of the sacrament of baptism, the relationship between spirit and flesh, the role of Israel in history, the life of the Christian, and freedom in Christ are treated with sound judgment, great biblical and theological perception, and reverence.

Those of us in the Reformed fellowship and of the Calvin heritage should take special note of his comments on Romans 12:3-8, with regard to unity in Christ, gifts of the Spirit, and the idea of "offices" (pp. 104, 105). What he says about predestination and election on page 157 will jar our traditional sensitivities. Brunner emphasized the "illogical and contradictory" aspect of the biblical teaching on election and predestination by the apparent inconsistency of the presentations in the book of Romans—the "double decree of predestination, one to salvation the other to damnation," as in the 9th chapter of Romans, and the doctrine of universal salvation, as in the 11th chapter of the same book. The final conclusion he draws about this matter is that even

though God predestines—some from eternity to eternity, he does not therefore reject others. Brunner insists that in spite of what appears to us a logical necessity which has been postulated in the traditional doctrine, a double decree cannot be logically substantiated from Scripture. What Brunner says about this and some other things takes careful reading and suggests the need for some deep reflection and sound thinking.

As a passage by passage rather than verse by verse commentary, this work by itself turns out to be more expository than exegetical. The commentary amounts to a series of theological discourses. The remarks are brief but pithy. Many matters have been distilled, and what comes out is the best that has come through one of the world's foremost theological minds and Christian spirits. A minister or layman who wishes to get the thrust of Romans quickly and have before him a number of valuable gems of Christian thought will do no better than to read this volume.

THOMAS BOSLOOPER

The Evidence of Tradition, by Daniel J. Theron, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958. Pp. xi-135. \$3.95.

This book, containing 106 selections from Greek and Latin writings of the early Christian era together with translation, is basically an enlargement upon the little booklet of William P. Armstrong, *Texts for Gospel History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1930), preserving essentially the form and order of that work.

Dr. Theron has presented, in collected form, some of the important source material bearing on the history of the early Christian church, the New Testament books and the New Testament canon. Covering a wide range of texts, he has provided a tool for use alongside of an introduction to the books of the New

Testament, furnishing the basic material upon which decision is to be made relative to authorship, provenance, order, canonicity, etc., of the various books, together with a decision as to the nature of the traditions contained therein and the transmission of this material. Such a tool, rightly used, becomes exceeding helpful in understanding the literature of the New Testament.

The usefulness of this work is greatly hampered by the failure of the author to present a brief statement at the head of each section explaining the nature of the documents and the concern and purpose of the writer in selecting his material. This would have enabled the reader to share the mind of the editor in presenting his material as he did.

In his presentation, he has failed to distinguish between texts citing or paralleling passages in the New Testament and texts dealing with the origin of the books. Fragments 29 and 55 are both out of place, as well as fragments 94 and 95. Under apocryphal and canonical gospels he has neglected to indicate in the subtitles that he is presenting excerpts from the Gospel of Peter (89) and from the Gospel of the Hebrews (90-93). While selections 94 and 95 refer to canonical Gospels they are not of the same nature as the other material in this section—e.g. the ending of Mark, the Agrapha (which should have had more citations)—and thus they should have been listed elsewhere and the title altered in accordance with the material presented.

In an attempt to be literal Dr. Theron has at times become slavishly wooden, sacrificing literary style, while at others he has neglected to give the vividness and finer shades of meaning of the original Greek and Latin texts.

Finally, one wonders why, in presenting parallels to New Testament material, he presented no other selections from non-canonical Gospels, or neglected to make greater use of the *Didache* and other early Christian literature,

including some of the recent finds, since he evidently did not intend to limit his material to selections which deal with the origin, authorship and canonicity of the various books.

VERNON H. KOOY

Studies in the Sermon on the Mount, by D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959. Pp. vii-320. \$4.50.

This volume (one of two on the subject), consists of thirty sermons preached for the most part on successive Sunday mornings in the course of the author's regular ministry at Westminster Chapel, London. They are based on Matthew 5:1-48. The first two chapters give a general introduction, a general view, and an analysis of the entire Sermon on the Mount. The third chapter is an introduction to the Beatitudes in particular. This aids the reader in orienting himself among the basic presuppositions of the author and avoids "missing the woods for the trees."

Some governing principles used in the interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount and in the interpretation of the Beatitudes are: (1) All Christians are to be like this; (2) All Christians are to manifest all of these characteristics; (3) None of these descriptions refers to what we may call a natural tendency (divine grace is required); and (4), These descriptions indicate the essential and utter difference between the Christian and the non-Christian.

The author does not interpret the Sermon on the Mount in this volume in terms of being new law, the obedience to which will bring in the Kingdom. On the contrary, he says, "The Sermon . . . comes to us and says, 'There is the mountain that you must scale . . . and the first thing you must realize . . . is that you cannot do it'" (p. 43). In other words, man needs something more

THE NEW TESTAMENT COMMENTARIES OF

John Calvin

A new, modern translation "in the sort of English he himself would have chosen"

— JAROSLAV PELIKAN

Edited by Thomas F. and David W. Torrance

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN Volume One

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN Volume Two

Translated by T. H. L. Parker \$4.50 each

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS

Translated by John W. Fraser \$5.00



Other volumes to follow to be priced from \$4 to \$5

Backgrounds to Dispensationalism

CLARENCE BASS. A most illuminating and objective inquiry into the origins and influences of the theology of J. N. Darby and the Scofield Bible, by the Associate Professor of Systematic Theology, Bethel Theological Seminary. \$3.50

The Kingdom of Love and the Pride of Life

EDWARD JOHN CARNELL. This significant new study in Christian apologetics appeals to love as the law of life and seeks to show how the gospel can further man's search for a happy, integrated life. \$3.00

New Testament Tools and Studies

BRUCE M. METZGER, EDITOR. A valuable new series for the scholar. Now ready: *Index to Periodical Literature on the Apostle Paul*, by Bruce M. Metzger. Coming: *Concordance to the Distinctive Greek Text of Codex Bezae*. Each, \$4.00

The Essential Nature of New Testament Preaching

ROBERT MOUNCE. This important study of the *kerygma*, by the Chairman of the Department of Christianity, Bethel College, is characterized by "sound scholarship, fresh treatment, and evangelical warmth." —F. F. Bruce \$3.50

Special Revelation and the Word of God

BERNARD RAMM. The thoroughness with which Dr. Ramm brings up-to-date the history of the discussions affecting this important subject, particularly as this is found in the writings of Barth and Brunner, gives this book a special value to all students of theology. \$4.00

The Old Testament View of Revelation

JAMES G. S. S. THOMSON. An exhaustive survey of the salient features of the nature, purpose and historical unfolding of God's saving activity as revealed through the writers of the Old Testament. \$2.50

WM. B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING COMPANY

255 Jefferson Avenue, S.E. Grand Rapids 3, Michigan

than what he is to himself to put these sermons into practical operation. Man stands in need of divine grace.

Though the chapters in this book are said to be sermons, the homiletical structure is vague. They lack unity, symmetry and progress and give the impression of being more in the form of essays rather than sermons. The interpretation of the sermon is soundly exegetical, the points are illustrated in an interesting and vivid way and the choice of words is admirable. The author gives the impression that he has one eye firmly fixed on Scripture and the other on the Christian who seeks to live in the world and to relate the law of God to the society in which he finds himself.

This volume would be most helpful to any serious-minded Bible student and especially to any minister who, like the author, plans to deal with this great sermon of our Lord.

GLEN O. PETERMAN

The Christ of the Gospels, by William F. Beck, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959. Pp. 227. \$3.00.

Ronald Knox, in his book, *Trials of a Translator*, quotes Mr. Belloc as saying that the business of a translator is not to ask "How shall I make this foreigner talk English?" but "What would an Englishman have said to express this?" And this is the principle used by William Beck in his translation of the life of Christ.

This is a harmony of the life of Christ. It seeks to be accurate without falling into the trap of placing Greek idioms into our English text. This calls for some imagination, plus a willingness to insert some interpretation. But the latter is to be found even in those texts that slavishly follow the original. Dr. Beck's sentences are short, with a number of contractions to make the conver-

sations alive and moving. On the other hand, the language is never trite. Where possible, the author has not hesitated to translate money and measurements into their present day equivalents.

In spite of the author's insistence on clarity — and I think he has done well — I would call attention to the passage in Luke 12:15. Here Beck has: "Be careful," He told the people. "Guard against every kind of greed. Not by having more than enough do you live on what you have." The last sentence doesn't make sense to me. I rather think the author has a thought here which may be very good, but he has failed to convey it to his readers.

All Old Testament quotations are indicated in footnotes, as also dates, days and geographical areas. This is very helpful. It is to be hoped that Dr. Beck's translation of the Old Testament on which he is now working, will follow this style. This is an excellent work for devotional reading, and the freshness of the language may well give the minister the experience of having a sermon jump from the page.

LAMBERT J. PONSTEIN

The Epistle to the Romans, by John Murray, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1959. Pp. xxii-408. \$5.00.

This is another of the works in the New International Commentary series on the New Testament. This first volume on the book of Romans covers the first eight chapters.

The work is conservative in theology, seeks to be careful in preserving a unity of thought, and shows the result of careful exegesis.

Professor Murray carries us through the opening chapters of Romans in which Gentile and Jew are declared to be guilty before God, and salvation is declared as coming from God alone and

through faith. It is very easy at this point to do an injustice to Paul's conception of good works and the law. But this is not true of the author of this commentary. Here is a good sentence. "Believers are justified by faith alone and they are saved by grace alone. But two qualifications need to be added to these propositions. (a) They are never justified by a faith that is alone. (b) In salvation we must not so emphasize grace that we overlook the salvation itself." For Murray there is an emphasis on a "judgment according to works" and he knows that for Paul the law is still that which is "spiritual."

A key passage such as Romans 6:14 is indicative of what one can expect in the way of careful work. In discussing "for ye are not under law but under grace" Murray points out that there were many people in the Old Testament who were under grace. On the other hand, merely to be relieved from the Mosaic law as an economy does not of itself place a person in the category of being under grace. It is only when we understand what the law can and cannot do, that the first part of the text "for sin will not have dominion over you", become clear. I cite this as an example of the clarity of the author's thought.

In addition to the commentary, there are four articles in an appendix, one an excellent study on the word "justification." This is a fine addition to Roman studies.

LAMBERT J. PONSTEIN

Predestination, and Other Papers, by Pierre Maury, Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960. Pp. 109. \$2.50.
A Predestination Primer, by John H. Gerstner, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960. Pp. 51. \$.85.

Pierre Maury was, before his death, one of the outstanding leaders in French Protestantism, a warm-hearted evangeli-

cal who served as pastor, professor of Reformed dogmatics, and ecumenical leader. This collection of his writings consists of an essay on the doctrine of election, which Maury uses interchangeably with predestination, and four sermons marked by biblical fidelity, relevance and Christ-centeredness. The treatment on predestination, which takes up more than one-half of the book, reflects the author's strong attachment to Karl Barth. All men are sinners; salvation is wholly of grace; all saved sinners are both elect and reprobate. "The elect and the castaways are not, at least until the end of history, two categories of persons, but two judgments of God upon the life of each of those whom he calls" (p. 65). Every Christian knows himself to be both rejected and accepted in Christ. "Does not each of us find quite simply, as we read our Bibles, how justly we are condemned, how truly we are lost? But then when we straightway ask for forgiveness we receive the witness of the mercy which is showed towards us in spite of everything" (p. 65). We then learn that rejection is the reverse side of God's love, that it is "non-existent in itself, yet very real." Maury is aware that his treatment is not that of Calvin, nor of classic theology from Augustine through the Reformers and Protestant orthodoxy, which would fill one with a "kind of holy terror." There God's love "is replaced by the arbitrary decision of pure omnipotence" and God must appear as a "capricious tyrant" (pp. 34f., 66). Maury shies away from philosophical argument in his essay and there is a strong Christ-centric emphasis in his thinking.

The booklet by Dr. Gerstner contrasts sharply with Maury's essay. Gerstner discusses the subject from the stance of Reformed orthodoxy with some of the usual logical argumentation to make the doctrine rationally appealing. After a helpful chapter on definitions he discusses total depravity in order to "see what must happen to [man] in order

to effect his salvation, and then come, not first but last, to predestinarianism" (p. 13). The divine initiative in grace also receives treatment and there follows a chapter in which objections to predestination are taken up. The treatment ends with a brief discussion on assurance, and appendices which include a collation of Scripture on the subjects discussed, the relevant sections in the Westminster Confession and the Larger Catechism, and diagrams of the terms used and the *ordo salutis*.

A position with which this reviewer agrees heartily is that the doctrine of predestination rests far more on the overall system of truth found in Scripture than on individual statements of the doctrine found here or there in the Bible. For the overall teaching of the Bible, its fundamental ideas, often presupposed and underlying other argumentation, is more significant than particular propositions found in its pages.

M. E. OSTERHAVEN

Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life, by Ronald S. Wallace, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959. Pp. xvi-349. \$5.00.

This book, which is an excellent addition to the growing Calvin library, follows the same style of presentation that the author adhered to in his earlier book, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament*. That book, in turn, followed the pattern of presentation of Calvin's thought in the book, *Calvin's Doctrine of Man*, which was written by the author's brother-in-law, Thomas F. Torrance. Wallace attempts to present the entire thought of Calvin as gleaned from the *Institutes*, commentaries, and sermons on a given subject. The author hopes to be faithful to the thought of Calvin and he, therefore, does not present a critique of the Reformer's thought as does Heinrich Quistorp in Calvin's

Doctrine of the Last Things, or Edward A. Dowey, in *The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology*. If the reader desires the latter method, he may not be completely happy with Wallace's work, but if the reader wants a faithful and true picture of Calvin's thought on the subject of the Christian life, he will surely find it in this book.

The book will commend itself to scholars who are concerned to find a carefully documented book which seeks to give a complete view of Calvin's thought on the subject of the Christian life. For the busy minister, the book is a rich mine of subjects in the area of Christian ethics, which any congregation should like to have elucidated. For those seeking a valuable devotional and deeply spiritual reflection on the nature of the Christian life, the book will meet those needs well.

The book presents a wide range of subject matter. The first part deals with the sanctification of the Church in Christ. Dying and rising with Christ is then considered. Wallace discusses the restoration of the image of God in the true order of man's life and the *meditatio futurae vitae*, which was a favorite subject of Calvin. Sanctification within the Church and adherence and loyalty to the visible Church is given full consideration. Wallace concludes that section with the following statements:

... the peace of the Church must be our first concern. Schism within the Church is a sign that individuals "find it difficult to accommodate themselves to the ways and habits of others," and that each of us would have a Church of his own if he could. But such splitting-up of the Church sunders it from Christ. The Church can be strong only when united. (p.248)

Wallace is very careful to show that Calvin's doctrine of the Church and the Christian life are intimately related. The true Christian life has no place in it

for divisiveness, which often characterizes much of Christ's Church. The last part of the book deals with the exercise of faith, of which prayer is primary and the effect and fruit of faith.

The book is especially a challenge not to the lover of Calvin but to the man who is suspicious of him. Any caricatures of the Reformer, which are always popular in the common mind, cannot be held after receiving a true insight through this book of what Calvin thought on this subject alone. The book will be a great help to any Christian who loves Christ and his Church and to all of his avid students.

ELTON J. BRUINS

God is Inescapable, by David Wesley Soper, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959. Pp. 9-128. \$2.50.

This is a remarkable little book for numerous reasons. The author's point of departure is found in several quotations taken from outstanding and renowned theologians. One of the included statements is by Paul Tillich. If the only reason for calling the book remarkable is that David W. Soper capably begins with a Tillich premise and then proceeds to develop the book with outstanding directness and clarity, then it would still merit the aforementioned conclusion. But there are other noteworthy characteristics. The language of the book is sharp and penetrating, making the book a pleasure to read. Although the theme is not necessarily unique, yet it is developed neatly, with many of the old shop-worn clichés and phrases replaced by words and illustrations that at least mean something to the modern man. This book could hardly be called real theology. It would be more plausible to call it criticism, but it is criticism at its best.

The purpose of the book is to develop in the reader a "... consciousness

of the presence and power of God, the God who is truly transcendent but also truly immanent" (p. 13). This God is found beyond and in us only as we break through our man-made gods; our religion, our nation, our society. "To break through to God beyond the gods is to discover, in yourself, unlimited resources of light and reason, already present but hidden, waiting to be mobilized, to be called into action, with strength and joy sufficient for the day" (p. 32). The discovery of the God beyond us (section 1), and the God within us (section 2), makes us increasingly at one with ourselves and our neighbors and our God (section 3).

This book will make interesting and unusual reading for the minister who is interested in making God's message relevant and for the man who wishes to make his Christian witness meaningful in this century. Try this book if you wish to read something out of the ordinary.

JAMES W. MEEUWSEN

Point of Glad Return, by Lance Webb, New York: Abingdon Press, 1960. Pp. 7-224. \$3.50.

Caught up in the background of this book I sense the conception of the redemptive power of Christ akin to that of the Heidelberg Catechism. There we find an emphasis upon the three things necessary "in order that we may live and die happy." In this book the redemptive power and purpose of God is set forth as the key to the total redemption of the human personality from sin and death. It is evident from the book that the total invasion of our experience by this redemptive person Jesus Christ, is an essential ingredient in life if we are to master our present circumstances and look triumphantly toward everlasting life and liberty.

Dr. Webb unfolds the redemptive implications of Jesus Christ as they apply to the pressing needs of every day

living in our time. As we face the frustrations of life, the successes of life, and the issues of life over which we have no control, we are confronted at every turn by the adequacy of the Gospel of God's Grace to confirm a hope that becomes incarnate in us when we submit our souls to the invading power of Christ's love.

The author draws upon twenty-five years of experience in the Christian ministry to illustrate and demonstrate the change that can be brought about in human experience by faith in Christ. Wherever and whenever life becomes our master instead of our subject, then we must return to Christ who alone is able to redeem us. When we encounter him anew by faith then we have reached the "point of glad return."

Christ's power to redeem us from the emptiness and boredom of our time, the pressure of guilt and fear, the threat to our eternal security implicit in our present temporal progress, and the innate frailties of the flesh that dog our steps from the cradle to the grave, is reverently and lovingly presented in this volume. Aglow with appropriate and helpful illustrations, this book should be of value to any pastor seeking to help his congregation relate Christ to their every day needs and problems.

DONALD P. BUTEYN

Steps to Salvation, by John H. Gerstner, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960. Pp. 9-192. \$3.95.

Jonathan Edwards was a combination of rare spiritual insight and keen intellectual perception. He was a theologian who was adept at relating the sometimes abstract conceptions of philosophy and theology to the very present needs and feelings of his contemporaries—and hence also of many generations. He was an intellectual evangelist. In that light we come to know this spiritual giant as a man whose mind did not shy at the great theological problems of his

time. He grappled with predestination, with the question of the freedom of the will, with matters related to both the sovereignty of God and the responsibility of man. And remarkably, from the modern viewpoint, he was strikingly successful in his evangelism. He brought a message so solidly biblical and so rich in the content of its teaching that some today might consider it impossible with such an emphasis to communicate truth, let alone draw men to Jesus Christ. But that was precisely his goal and it was in drawing men to Jesus Christ that he was most effective. The book reveals with what power his sermons covered the whole of God's Word. His messages "explore the nature of God, the essence of virtue, the fine points of salvation, the controversial issues of theology. None of these were withheld from his congregation, while in all of them he was urging his hearers to press on into the Kingdom" (p. 189). The fact that his parishioners were so well informed on matters of spiritual life may indicate why in the days of the great revivals of his time such issues were popular conversation in back yard or on the street. One wonders if today's lack of conversation about spiritual issues may not be due in part to lack of information.

This volume sets itself to the task, not of asking about Edwards' manner of speaking, but rather about the content of his message. That is not to say that his manner was not compelling, or that communication of truth does not require the utmost development in the lives of those who preach God's Word. Rather it is to say that great and monumental work in drawing men to Jesus Christ requires that the preacher have something to say, that it be undergirded and comprehended in the Word of God, and that it be fearlessly set forth.

The author concludes that Edwards was a faithful preacher of Calvinism. In the main, he saw the Bible as Calvin saw it. "This is not only clear from Edwards' preaching of sovereignty and

reprobation, of total depravity and imputation, of efficacious grace and the perseverance of the saints. It is also clear from the way in which he preached human ability and responsibility" (p. 190).

Probably the most distinctive thing about his evangelistic message was his emphasis upon "seeking." Here he stands midway between the Arminian and the Calvinistic extremes. He insists that there is something that the sinner can do. He can use the means of grace, obey the outward commandments, and prayerfully seek for God. However, he denies with vigor that the sinner can do what the Arminian view insists that he can. He disagrees with those Calvinists who consider that the sinner can do nothing that would move his soul toward God. Edwards maintains that there *is*—*He can seek!*

On matters pertinent to receiving the assurance of salvation his message at times was so exacting and searching that it tended to provoke introspective uncertainties among many believers whose lives were influenced by his preaching. Though he preached perseverance in its purity, it would seem that in his emphasis on assurance he places this precious spiritual gift almost beyond reach even of the most earnest.

For a provocative and stimulating encounter with the man Edwards and his emphasis, here is a study based on his sermonic treatment of God's Word that will bring spiritual rewards to those who stick with it.

DONALD P. BUTEYN

Western Asceticism, edited by Owen Chadwick, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1958. Pp. 368. \$5.00.

Primary sources are an indispensable tool for the understanding of church history. This being the case, every new edition which makes accessible hitherto

unavailable sources is always welcome. By now the collection of sources in English translation entitled the *Library of Christian Classics* has already won a wide and appreciative acceptance. It is not as inclusive as the Ante-Nicene, Nicene, and Post-Nicene series of the last century, but the new translations are much more readable, and the introductions make available the most important advances in patristics during the last fifty years.

The volume under review is not likely to be the most popular of the whole series, yet its importance will be much more apparent today than it would have been just a few decades ago. Monasticism has always been highly suspect among Protestants as being of the essence of "popery" and also as being a perverted form of Christianity. Today, however, a different wind is blowing. Thanks largely to the impact of the ecumenical movement with its serious attempt to understand why other Christians think and behave as they do, Protestants are giving a serious second look to the whole history of Christian asceticism from the time of the early Church to the present. We are learning that monasticism has a close tie with Puritanism. We are also discovering that much of its impulse toward discipline, other worldliness, and asceticism traces back to the character of the primitive Christian community. Indeed, the monks of St. Benedict, far from initiating something new, believed that they were merely perpetuating the early Christian Church.

Another reason for the importance of this book lies in recent interest throughout Protestantism generally in cell groups, group meditation, study sessions, and silent retreats. All of these techniques for strengthening the spiritual life are but modern adaptations of religious exercises practiced by Christian monks centuries ago, as a careful reading of *Western Asceticism* will make abundantly clear.

Prof. Chadwick has restricted his selection to three main sources which are closely related to one another. The first of these, "The Sayings of the Fathers," is a curious collection of deeds and words reputed to have come from Christian hermits in the Egyptian desert. It reads like a Christian Talmud, though instead of commenting on the Torah it comments on the nature of the devout life. The second document, "The Conferences of Cassian," also contains advice of certain Egyptian saints to a monastic who finally settled in the West. The reason both of these documents have been included in a book on Western asceticism is found in the fact that they both were written in Latin, and both had a profound effect on the later flowering of western monasticism as typified by the third document, "The Rule of St. Benedict." By all odds this is the most important of the three, since it underlay nearly every religious order to be founded in Europe up to the time of St. Francis. Yet it is more than just an important historical record of the past. There are many insights in the advice that Benedict gave to his monks which speak to our spiritual needs today. A careful study of the chapters on silence, on humility, and on prayer will prove rewarding to every Christian, Protestant as well as Catholic.

Only one question remains in the reviewers mind. Why did the editor give so much space to the "Sayings of the Fathers," and omit the Rule of St. Francis and other later rules in a book which is supposed to cover western asceticism? A selection including the latter works might be even more useful for an understanding of the Western Church.

WALLACE N. JAMISON

A Message to Catholics and Protestants, by Oscar Cullmann, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans

Publishing Co., 1959. Pp. 5-57. \$1.50.

Interpreting Protestantism to Catholics, by Walter R. Clyde, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959. Pp. 7-160. \$3.00.

Understanding Roman Catholicism, by Winthrop, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959. Pp. 7-192. \$3.50.

The decade now coming to an end has seen the publication of a number of volumes in which Protestants have tried to explain themselves to Catholics, or Catholics to Protestants, and others in which Catholics have tried to perform much the same service, mostly for the benefit of Protestants. It goes without saying that most of the authors have gone well out of the way to assure the reading public that their own form of the Christian religion was not nearly the monstrosity it was imagined to be. Some Protestant writers have tried to pay Catholicism the same favor. Plainly, the ecumenical air we now breathe in such large draughts has more than a little to do with this climate of opinion. On the positive side such writing has helped to correct many a false or distorted view of the other's theology and practice; further, it has made available large stores of information previously hid away in scholarly tomes. On the negative side such writing has often tended to conceal real issues, and to obscure points of profound difference which no ecumenical air can really blow away. More than that, it has tended to leave the impression that the Protestant may well rejoice in the wonder of his Catholic brother's religion; certainly he should not think of him as a candidate for conversion. That would spoil it all.

The three books reviewed here are of the general type indicated above. That by Cullmann does not look for organic unity between Protestants and Catholics,

but it does make a plea for a demonstration of "solidarity" between the two branches of the Christian faith. The volume by Clyde is, as the book jacket suggests, "never polemical and rarely controversial." Hudson's book is to serve as a "guide to papal teaching for Protestants," and pleads only for understanding of what modern popes have really been about with their bulls and decrees. Cullmann and Clyde seem far more sympathetic to the Catholic cause than Hudson is, but it must be remembered that Hudson is trying to present his material as objectively as possible. No doubt Clyde would like to make the same claim for his work, but there are reasons for concluding that this is not quite the case.

Professor Cullmann has worked very closely with Catholic scholars for many years. He has sensed in these associations that many Catholics are his brothers in Christ, and that there is a quite definite bond of spiritual fellowship between them and him. He therefore calls for an empirical demonstration of this fellowship, an expression of solidarity, "of brotherhood among all who invoke the name of Christ" (p. 36). This expression would "recognize one another as brothers in Christ—in the same Christ, our mutual Lord" (*Idem.*). He feels that such a demonstration would change the atmosphere between Catholics and Protestants completely (p. 54). The peculiar expression of this solidarity, according to Cullmann's recommendation, would come about through an annual receiving of offerings for one another during a period of prayer in the two churches (p. 33). He cites a number of instances in which this kind of thing has been done in a number of places where he has presented his plea. This little volume considers the range of objections which have been presented to him from both sides. Whatever one may think of the proposal, it is at least profoundly thought-provoking.

Dr. Clyde's book has many fine things

about it. It contains a good deal of information about Catholic beliefs and practices not familiar to most Protestants. The author has made a serious attempt to be understood, and he achieves his end. Short, simple sentences assist him in this. What is disturbing about this volume is not in what it has to say about Roman Catholic religion particularly, but in what it says Protestantism is. Since Catholics are having Protestantism explained to them by the book, the Protestantism explained certainly ought to be the very best. Since there is very little unanimity among Protestants as to what that might be, each "holding out," in a sense, for his own brand, it might be just about impossible to come up with the very best kind. The alternative is hardly to adopt a simple, non-doctrinal form of Protestantism reduced to a lowest common denominator. This is what Dr. Clyde appears to do. The end result is an idealized and much simplified version of Protestantism, very different from that found in strong denominational viewpoints. Few Protestants would recognize themselves or their churches in the author's descriptions. For example, on the Scriptures Clyde says, "Protestants believe that a church should never finally close a canon, but should always be ready to reconsider and restate its canon" (p. 49). This would be of considerable interest to Catholics, whose body of Tradition represents a veritable open canon on "inspired" materials.

In speaking about the church's right to make laws for her people, the author says, "Protestants allow their churches to make no such laws. No church, they believe, Protestant or Catholic, has power from Christ to specify anything to be sin" (p. 58). The church may only offer an opinion on the subject. Certainly a great many Protestant churches believe they may rule on sins, and put them down in their books in black and white. To deny this is to deny the facts of past and current his-

tory. On the matter of the atonement, the author offers a very subjective view of the matter, prefacing his statement with "Most Protestants think as follows" (p. 73). Most liberal Protestants would agree with what follows, not the greater part of the Protestant church. On page 83 dubious views on the subject of salvation are presented and attributed to all or most Protestants. A sample is found on the bottom of that page: "But all Protestants wish that somehow God could keep open the possibility of salvation even for those in hell."

The volume by Dr. Hudson is of much higher quality, and its main purpose is to expound modern papal teaching for the benefit of Protestants. The area of instruction is limited to matters of a more public interest, such as church and state interests, Catholic action, political attitudes, and the like. There are generous quotations from important papal sources. A fine appendix deals with the matter of when a pope actually makes "ex Cathedra" pronouncements, that is, infallible statements. There is also a brief but helpful list of books for further reading. This little book is well worth having.

ELTON M. EENIGENBURG

Ecumenism and the Evangelical,
by J. Marcellus Kik, Grand Rapids:
Baker Book House, 1958. Pp. v-
152. \$3.50.

I found this little book very stimulating. The author presents some insights on the contemporary ecumenical movement which every church leader ought to consider. He probes deeply into the meaning of Christian unity, asking seriously what kind of unity the church really needs most badly. "Love and peace are as visible as concrete and stone" (p. 53). He maintains ably that consistency of message is more important than organizational oneness. His emphasis on a unity produced by the indwelling Holy Spirit is much needed in

this whole ecumenical discussion. In attacking those ecumenics who place such high value on apostolic succession of office, Rev. Kik puts his point with humor. "To paraphrase a statement of John the Baptist, 'Think not to say, we have Bishops for our ordination; for I say unto you, that God is able of these nonconformists to raise up an ordained ministry'" (pp. 83-84).

I must say, however, that I found a too-easy categorization in the author's approach to his subject. An "ecumenist" seems to be caricatured as one who is devoted to the goal of establishing a super church without the least concern for theological truth or Christian purity. An "evangelical" appears to be the opposite in all respects. Thus, I believe, the author has constructed an easy dichotomy which oversimplifies the problems involved. I would ask if there is no such thing as an evangelical ecumenist. The reviewer has considered himself one.

I also find myself somewhat out of sympathy with the author's evaluation of the theological conflicts of our day. Mr. Kik seems to feel that these discussions on vital points of doctrine are tragic. He would have the Church remain satisfied with the human formulations of the past. It seems to me that these very conflicts indicate the vitality of Christian theology today. I am firmly convinced that each generation must struggle with the crucial issues of Christian faith and raise its confessional voice in response to the biblical witness.

One other question I would raise as to the author's approach is his tendency toward dogmatic statements on highly questionable matters. He makes sweeping generalizations about his opponents (for he seems to consider all ecumenists as opponents of the evangelical), forcing all of them into a mold which would not describe even a majority. He also engages in some questionable exegesis in support of his views. This was especially evident in the last chapter on

"The Coming Great Church." In support of his view that the Church will triumph on earth through proclaiming the gospel, he quotes passages from Old and New Testament, interpreting them in a very questionable manner. He climaxes the point by quoting Revelation 12:9 and 11 as foretelling this victory of the Church, seemingly overlooking that these verses describe a war *in heaven* between the *angels* and the hosts of the Dragon and that the twelfth verse points to *continued woe* on earth. In this connection, the author ignores Scriptural evidence pointing toward the decline of the Church and a cataclysmic eschaton. (Mark 13 and parallels; Matthew 7:13, 14; 1 Timothy 4:1; Luke 18:8; *et al*).

I would like to have had the author bring into his discussion the fact that the Church stands under judgment and is in constant need of repentance and renewal. In this connection he might have developed the point that the early heresies which divided the Church (Arianism, Pelagianism, etc.) are still extant among us. This being so, ought not the divisions which they engendered still obtain? I feel that this can and should be a continuing aspect of a vital self-correcting process within an imperfect Church.

GARRET WILTERDINK

Counseling For Church Vocations, by Samuel Southard, Nashville: Broadman Press, 1957. Pp. 1-122. \$2.00.

In this brief volume Dr. Samuel Southard, who is professor of pastoral psychology at the Institute of Religion, Houston, Texas, addresses himself to the problem of enlisting young men and

women for religious vocations, including the pulpit and pastoral ministry.

The focus of the discussion is on the pastor and counsellor and his responsibility for finding the proper candidates for this Christian ministry. Far from being a plea that all young men who feel they have been "called" ought to be encouraged to enter the ministry, the author urges frank and critical examination of that which is assumed to be a divine call.

In a day when a dearth of ministers is being experienced in many communions this book speaks of a hopeful message. The author will not, however, let a situation of scarcity lead the Church to compromising its qualifications for these high offices. He is truly concerned that more men shall be found but is equally concerned that they be men with real aptitude for the work.

The author is guided to his conclusions by some 1500 replies to a questionnaire distributed among students of twenty seminaries of seven denominations. Out of those "findings" comes the central thesis, viz., that pastors and counsellors have both the privilege and the responsibility for discovering and directing the proper young persons. The fact that many who once felt the call and then did not pursue it points again to failure of pastors to be on the alert.

Though based on case studies this volume is not a stiff documentary in the ordinary understanding of that term. The language is non-technical and easily within the comprehension of any average layman. This excellent book is very readable and can easily be read in one sitting; in fact, such treatment will most likely make the impact the author has in mind. The subject is timely and challenging.

A. A. DYKSTRA

BOOK NOTES

Basic Beliefs of the Reformed Faith, by Felix B. Gear, Richmond: John Knox Press, 1960. Pp. 80. 60c.

Here is an excellent study guide to fundamental biblical doctrines. It is "not meant to be a reading book" but rather a guide for individual or group study. As such it is tops!

The doctrines studied are the sovereignty of God, the problem and possibilities of man, Christ, salvation, predestination, and the Church. Each subject is divided into two study units so that there are twelve units in all. If a class should desire, two sessions could be spent on each unit. There are "Questions to Think About" at the end of each study and suggestions for further reading. Each study is based on an appropriate passage from the Bible and the discussion does not lose its biblical orientation. Another commendable feature is the interesting and relevant style. E.g., the prophet speaks to "displaced persons;" the reader is reminded of the soul-restlessness which results in the revolutionary age in which we live; there are allusions to our "space age," and in other ways the book has a contemporary flavor. This reviewer would like each of our ministers to procure a copy and consider using it in a class of high school pupils or older.

The publisher is to be congratulated for putting out a fine little book for a nominal price.

M. E. OSTERHAVEN

All the Way to Calvary, by Ona E. Hall, New York: Greenwich Book Publishers, 1958. Pp. 74. \$2.50.

This book focuses attention upon the record of the tabernacle in the wilderness and upon the Saviour and church which it foreshadows. The purpose of the author is to examine the tabernacle in all its aspects, its design, its furnishings, its services, including sacrifices and offerings, to see what it meant to Israel and what it means to us.

The book does not particularly bear the marks of a scholar. Passages of Scripture quoted are not always apropos. There is considerable repetition in it. The author tends to make the Old Testament Scripture signify more than was intended. Often the author's denominational affiliation is apparent. The content of the book does not justify the title given it. The purpose of the author in writing this book is fairly well attained. Several important and interesting "types and shadows" of Christ and his church are lifted up. The book serves to remind us of the old truth that "the new is in the old contained; the old is by the new explained."

JACOB PRINS

Christians Alive, by Bryan Green, New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1959. Pp. 125. \$2.95.

Christian Alive, written by that well known English author, Bryan Green, reminds us of the scriptural truth that "He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also to walk as he walked" (I John 2:6), and "Because as he is so are we in this world" (I John 4:17b). For the purpose of the author, as indicated in his preface, is to present a challenging view of "what it means to be a Christian in the world today."

The conviction of the author that thoughtful people are entitled to know

what is implied in the demands of Christian discipleship today before they are asked to make a complete commitment to him, is evident in the book. The author is convinced, and convinces the reader, that "the basic principles of living which Jesus gave us, the spirit with which he lived, are as applicable today as they ever were." These basic principles are made clear. How we can make them our very own is indicated.

The purpose of the author is clearly revealed in every chapter. In understandable language he reveals "Where Real Christianity Begins," as he does in his first chapter, and where it leads as indicated in the chapters that follow. The book obviously is intended for the ordinary man, who wants to know what it means to be a Christian and to lead the Christian life.

Christians Alive is the kind of book one can commend without any reservations. Its scriptural and practical emphasis commends itself to every reader. It convinces one anew of the fact that "religion has everything to do with *this* life and *this* world as well as to do with that *life* and *that* world."

JACOB PRINS

The Praying Christ, by James G. S. S. Thomson, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1959. Pp. 152. \$3.00.

The Praying Christ is a marvelous exposition of Jesus' doctrine and practice of prayer. As indicated in the preface, the book has not been written primarily for the scholar, although it is scholarly, but for the Christian minister and layman. The contents reveal the divine pattern for prayer, making clear from the Scripture, its nature, aim and method.

The purpose of the author in writing this book is clearly established. Never once does the author deviate from that purpose. The first two chapters, devoted

specifically to "The Lord's Teaching On Prayer" and "The Lord's Practice Of Prayer" set the standard consistently followed in the book.

The author presents as fine an analysis of Jesus' high-priestly prayer (John 17), and of that prayer which has helped shape the life of the church—the Lord's prayer, as we have ever read. His exposition of the intercessory ministry of our Lord is magnificent. The biblical and theological character of the book, coupled with its intensely practical application commends itself to every devout Christian, causing him or her to say again and again: "Lord, teach us to pray."

JACOB PRINS

Fundamentalism and Evangelism, by John R. W. Stott, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1959. Pp. 80. \$1.50.

The material published in this little book was first widely distributed in the British Commonwealth near the time of the Billy Graham Crusade. It is a reply to those who criticised Graham's efforts as a "fundamentalist mission" with a narrow message and an emotional appeal.

Mr. Stott quotes the Oxford Dictionary defining fundamentalism as "strict adherence to traditional orthodox tenets held to be fundamental to the Christian faith" and then asserts, "Now if this is fundamentalism, one hopes that every individual Christian is a fundamentalist!" (p. 12). He contends that "fundamentalism" has often been associated with undesirable extremes, especially toward biblical inspiration and interpretation. Then he sets forth the biblical doctrine of Scripture held by true fundamentalism, insisting upon the absolute necessity of divine revelation with the practical purpose of bringing sinners to Christ.

In the second part of the book the author shows the relative places of the

mind, the emotions, and the will in evangelism. He defends the preaching of the Cross and gives a fine analysis of the elements in conversion.

This is an excellent little volume. Reading this plain discussion on these vital subjects could clear the minds and stir the hearts of many people in our churches.

J. ROBERT STEEGSTRA

Tracts and Treatises on the Reformation of the Church, by John Calvin, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1958. Three vols. \$15.00.

With the republication of this set, Eerdmans has put the Church in its debt. It was not easy to secure the Beveridge translation of the *Tracts and Treatises*, and without it, even though one had the *Institutes* and many of the commentaries, one did not have a full view of the thought of Calvin. These three volumes contain many of the most significant of the occasional writings of Calvin, related, as they were, to the real situations in Calvin's life when he was called upon to explain and defend, controvert and deny. Sometimes, as in the violence of controversy, we see a Calvin we do not find in the *Institutes* and commentaries, a man who is overstating his case in order to secure his point. Unfortunately too many later Calvinists took their cue from the extreme statement, rather than from the balance that is found only in a careful examination of every statement from every possible source. We highly recommend the purchase of these volumes to every Reformed pastor, and to everyone who wants to become acquainted with the "whole" Calvin. Prof. Thomas F. Torrance of Edinburgh has written a very fine introduction to the work. Volume I is mainly concerned with the points of difference between the Roman Catholic Church and the new churches of the Reformation. Volume II takes up

the constructive features of the Reformation church in matters of doctrine and worship, and Volume III is devoted to "the defense of the Reformed Faith." A veritable treasure house of Reformed thought!

ELTON M. EENIGENBURG

If I Believe, by Donald J. Campbell, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959. Pp. 157. \$2.50.

It is the author's conviction that the real difficulty many of us have in religion is not intellectual but moral. Our lack is not so much in belief as in translation of belief into daily living. The author tries to spell out the implications of Christian belief as clearly as possible in terms of actual living in the modern day and age. He seeks to answer the question: Given such a belief, how will it, how should it, affect my life? The book is written in non-ecclesiastical style that will appeal to laymen. It will also be a helpful book for clergymen who wish to make sermons on the basic Christian beliefs which are practical for the members of their congregations. There are individual chapters on: "If I Believe in God," "Jesus Christ," "Prayer," "The Christian Life," "Sin," and "Eternal Life."

HERBERT S. VAN WYK

When Trouble Comes, by James E. Sellers, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960. Pp. 128. \$2.00.

The subtitle for this book is, *A Christian View of Evil, Sin, and Suffering*. Dr. Sellers classifies the evil confronting men into two distinct groups: physical evils such as storms, floods, and death; and moral evil, which is suffering at the hands of men rather than at the hands of nature, and which is manufactured in our own hearts.

Dr. Sellers points out the resources a Christian possesses for combating

both forms. "Suffering is an inescapable part of reality. We cannot avoid it, though with God's help we can fight it—opposing physical evil with our brains and other talents, and opposing moral evil with our resolve to turn toward God."

If one is looking for a closely knit and highly philosophical treatment of the problem of evil, sin, and suffering he will not find it in this book; moreover, if he is looking for an easy answer to the problem of evil, he will not find it here. However, if one is looking for helpful suggestions, these he will find. One of the strongest features of the book is Dr. Sellers' excellent use of very clear illustrations.

HERBERT S. VAN WYK

Organized For Action, by Guido A. Merkens, St. Louis: The Concordia Publishing House, 1959. Pp. 1-125. \$2.50.

One of the areas in which many of our churches are weak is in that of promotion. We have sufficient organizations to be sure, but most of them seek only to bring people into more meetings where they do nothing but sit and listen. Here is a book that tells you how to organize for action, or as the sub-title states it, "How to Build A Successful Parish and Its Program."

The author, pastor of the Concordia Lutheran Church in San Antonio, Texas, the youngest Lutheran church in the area, but the largest, believes that you must get your people to work. He writes, "Impression without expression leads to repression." It is not enough to tell people that they possess the spiritual gifts of the Triune God; we must lead them to use these gifts or they will doubt our words and lose their "gifts" through disuse.

Literally dozens of ways are suggested by which the average church can enlist its members in the work of

the kingdom. Almost all can be successfully adopted or altered to fit a given situation if the church is progressive and has a mind to work.

So detailed is this book that the last section consists of copies of letters that the author has used to encourage and enlist members in the army of the Lord. These are so well written they come very close to being worth the cost of the book alone.

CHESTER J. DROOG

Sermons in Stories for Children, by Graham R. Hodges, New York: Abingdon Press, 1959. Pp. 96. \$1.75.

In this volume the author presents forty-two stories for children, each based on a scriptural text, and illustrating some phase of truth related to life. He has the art of seeing these truths all about him, in cocklebur seeds, alfalfa, hidden treasures, migrating birds, baseball, horseflies, and stories from the Bible and incidents from history. Says the author: "All nature, the whole world, the mighty cosmos, and the tiniest bit of life about us literally cry out with a message of God's creativity, love, and care. We see him everywhere if we but stop to look and listen. Had we adults but the open mind of a child, our lives would be a ceaseless stretch of imagination." While the lesson of each story is simple enough for children, the language is too advanced for younger children, e.g., such words as finances, fascinated, discouraged, reversing, destiny. These are but a few of the three and four syllable words taken from the first page. However, anyone schooled in the art of retelling stories to smaller children could substitute simpler words. The book can be a real help to those who search for children sermon material or stories to tell to children.

EDWARD H. TANIS

Strange Altars, A Scriptural Appraisal of the Lodge, by J. W. Acker, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959. \$1.00.

In the preface, the author states that "for some years The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod has probably been the most articulate among the larger Protestant religious bodies in this country in opposition to lodges, especially in its publications." This monograph is not intended as an exhaustive treatment of the subject but as a digest for the purpose of clearly delineating the scriptural principles underlying the church's stand against the lodge. The author illustrates concisely the objectionable features of the fraternal orders considered. He defines the lodge as "a secret fraternal benefit society which has a printed ritual with prayers, altar, chaplain, burial ceremony, an oath, the claim of spiritual advancement, and the guarantee of heaven as a reward for following the principles of the order" (p. 10). He traces the growth of fraternalism, calls masonry the "Mother of Lodges," explains the structure of masonry with its degrees, affiliates, and female appendages. He discusses masonry in the light of Scripture, with masonry's view of the Bible, God, Christ, the plan of salvation, as well as their practices and oaths. There is a chapter on the so-called "animal" lodges: Eagles, Elks, and Moose, as well as an evaluation of civic clubs, veterans' organizations, and youth organizations. Anyone interested in a brief résumé of the lodge will find a great deal of information packed in this 94 page book.

EDWARD H. TANIS

You Can Have A New Life, by Everett W. Palmer, New York:

Abingdon Press, 1959. Pp. 7-127. \$2.25.

Dr. Palmer presents this volume out of a rich background of many varied experiences. He worked as a ranch hand in South Dakota, a gold miner, and finished college with the aid of a football scholarship. In 1950 he was an exchange preacher to England. In 1954 he was one of four men invited by the Air Force High Command to preaching missions at bases in the Far East. In 1956 he lectured and conducted seminars in Europe with prominent leaders in government, industry, labor, education and religion.

Although his approach is primarily psychological rather than theological, Dr. Palmer seeks to show how one is to meet everyday problems with the resources of the Christian faith. Temptations, worry, anxiety, hostility, sorrow, resentment, loneliness, weakness and discouragement are a real part of contemporary living. He indicates in successive chapters, as he treats these problems, how they can be overcome by the Christian. A faith that sustains, a holiness that cleanses, a hope that heals and a love that empowers will prove to be invaluable aids in living a new life.

The author presents three propositions on page 21: 1. "Man of all living creatures is most capable of change. 2. The church is a teacher with a changing student body; hence what appears to be failure is evidence of the learning process. 3. Human nature can be transformed by the power of Christ."

This little volume can be of real assistance to a busy pastor as background reading as he seeks to help his people as a Christian counselor.

HENRY A. MOUW

WRITERS IN THIS ISSUE

ARTICLES

Harold N. Englund begins his first year as president of the seminary. We are publishing his address given at the fall convocation.

John H. Kromminga is president of Calvin Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan. This is his lecture presented at our seminary last spring.

Peter Hsieh is a member of the faculty of Trinity Theological College, Singapore, Malaya.

James Meeuwse is pastor of First Church, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Henry J. Boekhoven is pastor of Bethel Reformed Church, Abbotsford, British Columbia, Canada.

BOOK REVIEWS

Lester J. Kuyper is a member of the seminary faculty.

Thomas Boslooper has recently become pastor of Second Church, Schenectady, New York.

Vernon H. Kooy is a member of New Brunswick Theological Seminary faculty, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Glen O. Peterman has recently become the pastor of First Church, Pella, Iowa.

Lambert J. Ponstein is a member of Hope College faculty, Holland, Michigan.

M. E. Osterhaven is a member of the seminary faculty.

Elton J. Bruins is pastor of the Reformed Church, Elmsford, New York.

Donald P. Buteyn is pastor of First Church, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Wallace N. Jamison is a member of the New Brunswick Theological Seminary faculty, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Elton M. Eenigenburg is a member of the seminary faculty.

Garret Wilterdink has recently become pastor of Midland Reformed Church, Midland, Michigan.

A. A. Dykstra is field representative for the Reformed Church Colleges, Holland Michigan.

BOOK NOTES

Jacob Prins is pastor of Forest Grove Church, Hudsonville, Michigan.

J. Robert Steegstra is pastor of Covenant Church, Muskegon Heights, Michigan.

Herbert S. Van Wyk is pastor of Second Church, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Chester J. Droog is pastor of Fifth Church, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Edward H. Tanis is pastor of Faith Church, Zeeland, Michigan.

Henry A. Mouw is pastor of Sixth Church, Holland, Michigan.



